

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1873.

ART. I.—THEODORE PARKER.

Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker. By JOHN WEISS. New York: D. Appleton & Company. 1864.

Miss Cobbe's Edition of Parker's Works.

THE *Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker*, written and edited by John Weiss, appeared about eight years ago, some four years after Mr. Parker had fallen asleep under the sunny skies of Italy. It is the work of a personal friend of the man whose history it records and whose memory it embalms. It is rumored that Mr. Weiss undertook this biography in accordance with the express desire of the deceased, though he himself professes to derive his authority and opportunity to write only from Mrs. Parker. The author evidently feels a profound enthusiasm for his subject, and displays a courageous devotion to the doctrines and principles to whose exposition and propagation Parker's life was given. He accords the fullest credit to every statement from the lips of his departed friend, and gleans up with filial piety such scraps from his voluminous journal, and such letters from his vast correspondence, as shed any ray of light upon his career and opinions. Studied in connection with his published works, this *Life* enables us to contemplate and estimate Parker, no longer under the glint of crossing swords and in the blaze of eager controversy, but leisurely, calmly, with patience, and a judgment undisturbed by

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXV.—1

the heats of affection. It is well that the record of the Works and Days of Parker was made by warm friends whose love was frequently too much for their judgment, since in this way we obtain a better opportunity to study and comprehend the man. To accept the showing of these ardent admirers, we should find him one of the noblest specimens of manly and saintly character which has blossomed in the thick and heavy atmosphere of our degenerate day. If such partiality sometimes inflicts too much indiscriminate eulogy on the impatient reader, it has the decided merit of trying to unfold Parker's story as far as possible in his own language.

The family from which Theodore Parker sprang traces its history back to certain dwellers in Browsholme, a hamlet of York County in England. The name indicates their social standing and quality as foresters or park-keepers. There were Quakers and Puritans and a brace of Non-Conforming clergymen among those who bore the name in the mother country. Some branch of the family had attained the dignity of a coat-of-arms with an ample blazon of leopards' heads, stars, and with a stag pierced by an arrow for a crest. Their motto was "*Semper aude*"—a motto which at least one of their race was to obey in a spirit which might even have provoked the admiration of Danton with his "Audacity, audacity, audacity forever!"

Thomas Parker came to America in 1635, in a vessel fitted out by Sir Richard Saltonstall. He settled at Lynn, Massachusetts, and was made a freeman in 1637. As one of the original settlers in the town, forty acres of land were assigned him; this tract is included within the limits of the present town of Saugus. In 1640 he removed to Reading. He was one of seven who formed the first Church gathered in that ancient town, and in 1637 he was chosen one of its deacons. He rejoiced in six sons and four daughters, and died, in 1683, at the advanced age of seventy-four. His descendants grew and multiplied; they were solid and reliable men of the sort that view land, teach school, drill and train militiamen, have the itch for fighting in their very bones, and delight in the titles of lieutenant and captain. They were not remarkably thrifty people, and their one famous son might have said of them in the lump, as Lord Brougham did of his forefathers, that he had not

been able to discover that any of them had ever been remarkable for any thing. Now and then a touch of pure and manly Christian piety appears among their dusty and yellow papers; but Mr. Weiss seems suspicious that all such weaknesses came into the family from an occasional intermarriage with deacons' daughters.

In 1710 John Parker, a grandson of Thomas, removed from Reading, with all his children and grandchildren save one son, to Lexington, then known as Cambridge Farms. Here they settled on a tract of land, part of which still remains in possession of the family. They were rudely skilled in a great variety of employments, and, as is apt to be the case with such, were nicely skilled in nothing. Their education was mostly self-conducted, and commonly resulted in just enough knowledge to enable them to keep their accounts in a manner that would be a deep grief to the soul of the modern schoolmaster, bent on the education of mankind. John Parker, the grandfather of Theodore, was born in this place in 1729. He had the traditional military instincts of the family in full measure; he was sergeant in the old French and Indian war, and carried a light fowling-piece at the surrender of Quebec. Returning to peace and the pursuits of agriculture at the close of that struggle, we have no further glimpse of him until the outbreak of the American Revolution. His minister, the Rev. Jonas Clark, not only preached politics from the pulpit, but had a hand in some of the active measures which hastened the outbreak of hostilities. His parishioners were mostly of his own way of thinking, and they formed a company of minute-men to prepare for resistance to the British. Of this company Sergeant Parker became captain. At one o'clock on the morning of the 19th of April, 1775, word came to Captain Parker, who lived about three miles from the village green, that regular officers were riding up and down the road insulting and capturing honest folks. Though ill in body, he hastened to the scene of danger, consulted with the minister and others whom he found there, and resolved not to risk his slender force of seventy raw men against nine hundred regular soldiers unless subjected to abuse or molestation. The Government forces came up and poured out three volleys on the rebels, killing seven and wounding eight. After returning a feeble and scat-

tering fire, the militia were ordered to disperse and take care of themselves. The country rose to repel the enemy, and the English speedily beat a retreat toward Boston. Captain Parker was too ill to join vigorously in the pursuit. He was present and in command of troops on the 17th of June following, at the battle of Bunker Hill, but had not the felicity to be called into action. In the next September he died, and we humbly trust has never encountered Theodore in the unseen world. The latter cites the words of his grandfather, as attested thirty-five years later by his orderly sergeant, to show that Captain Parker desired the war to begin then and there, if war was really meant; also that he held his men bravely to their work until he thought best to disperse them. He states these items in a letter to the historian Bancroft, and thinks they should be preserved to future generations. We do what we can to assist this honorable and pious design, though with some misgivings over the well-known elasticity of memory in veteran survivors of famous battles. Vanish, O homespun Captain, from the scene of human affairs! Vainly shall obscurity clutch at thy name. Thou didst head the column of American democracy in its earliest bloody conflict with royal power, and therefore shall thy humble name be had in remembrance in all the earth.

But before Captain Parker had stumbled upon unexpected immortality, was born to him another John Parker, Feb. 14, 1761. This son was father to Theodore, and is therefore of great interest to us. He married Hannah Stearns of Lexington; their domestic life was peaceful and happy. Here are sketches of them as they appeared to Theodore. The father was more a mechanic than farmer, and left the farm-work mainly to his boys, while he made and mended wheels, pumps, and farming-tools. He was very fond of books, and used to read aloud in the long winter evenings to wife and children. When the clock told the hour of eight, a wave of the reader's hand dismissed the juniors to bed. He was stoutly built, able-bodied, ingenious, and industrious. He had studied algebra, geometry, and was a master-hand at figures; he talked well, and might have become an orator. He did not like debate, though his ability in it was conspicuous. He had a love for metaphysics, psychology, and all branches of mental and moral

philosophy, and had read all the works on philosophy. He slept but five hours, and rose before day for study. He was acute in philosophical analysis, jovial and funny, but lacked the exuberant and grotesque mirthfulness of his famous son. He was good-mannered, and not clownish, profane, or indecent in his humor. He was inclined to think for himself in religion, and *hated* Jonathan Edwards and Paley. "Paley left us no conscience," was his verdict on that writer. He denied eternal punishment, and rejected the more extravagant miracles of the Bible. But he read the Scriptures with assiduity, and, on Sunday evenings, taught his little ones the ten commandments, prayers, and hymns. He was a Unitarian in theology, before there was any such religious body in the land. He did not like poetry, but read Milton, Dryden, Shakspeare, Pope, Trumbull, Peter Pindar, and Abraham Cowley. In later life he was fond of novels. He was a Federalist when only four others were to be found in his native town. He was just, fearless, a lover of peace, administered estates, and was guardian for widows and orphans. He was not thrifty, was a wise friend of education, and never grew rich. He took much pains with the intellectual and moral training of his family.

The mother was handsome, delicate, slightly-built, industrious, thrifty, and generous to the poor. She loved to hear her husband read of an evening, while the family sewing or knitting busied her restless hands; and she was fond of simple ballads and popular tales. Her familiarity with the Scriptures was unusual, and she had her favorite hymns. She had delicacy of mind, and a dainty imagination. Doctrines were in no great esteem with her, though she belonged to the Church and had all her babes duly christened. She was free from bigotry, cant, and fear. She took love and good works for religion. She bred up her family in such piety as she herself had, and kept all bigoted reading out of the household. Her manners were grave and gentle, but touched with the old Puritan state, till the mild blue eyes sometimes grew austere. She taught the children to repeat their prayers, after her careful hand had tucked them up snugly in bed for the night.

Such a picture deserves our careful examination. When a great man of any sort appears, he is rarely unheralded by kinsmen who foreshadow his best qualities. From his worthy

father Theodore Parker inherited strength of body, ability in speech, love of metaphysics, *hatred* of Paley and Jonathan Edwards, disbelief in some of the miracles in the Bible, reverence for the Scriptures, Unitarian theology, such natural virtues as he had, love of learning, and habits of diligence in labor and study. It is implied, though not directly asserted, that his father's view of the inspiration of the sacred writers was much the same that Theodore carried with him, in 1834, to the Cambridge Divinity School. Theodore's taste for poetry, hard as he strove to mold it aright, was essentially derived from his father; for what he wrote and what he cites from others is nearly always didactic and rhetorical, very rarely of an imaginative quality. If his mother had the delicate mind and fine gifts of imagination which are ascribed to her, she did not communicate them to her noted son. It seems that Hannah Stearns ministered to the spiritual welfare of her children so far as it was attended to in the home circle. When she had stout Theodore baptized, he kicked and struggled, protested, and inquired what it all meant. She shared in their rehearsals of prayer, sought to make them well-bred and honest, and in particular strove to render them obedient to conscience. The father forbade the school-teacher to instruct his youngest child in the Westminster Catechism. The mother did not meddle with the personal religious life of her offspring. The only incident of the early years of Theodore which reveals her in her natural and solemn office as the religious teacher of her child is thus described: "I had lifted my hand to smite a turtle when a voice within me said clear and loud, 'It is wrong!' . . . I hastened home and told my mother the tale, and asked her what it was that told me it was wrong? She wiped a tear from her eye with her apron, and, taking me in her arms, said, 'Some men call it conscience, but I prefer to call it the voice of God in the soul of man. If you listen and obey it, then it will speak clearer and clearer, and always guide you right; but if you turn a deaf ear or disobey, then it will fade out little by little, and leave you in the dark and without a guide. Your life depends on heeding this little voice.'"

Assuming the exactness of this account, (though we shall learn that we cannot always depend on Theodore's memory in such details,) the following things are to be noted. The

influence of the home was not religious in the scriptural sense of that term. Mr. Parker was not a member of the Church, was an inconsistent believer in miracles and the inspiration of the Scriptures, rejected the deity of Jesus Christ and those notions of experimental piety which depend entirely upon that dogma, and, I fear, *hated* the religious life of Edwards and Paley quite as much as their erroneous doctrines. Such was the intellectual and theological atmosphere in which the active mind of Theodore expanded. It is not to be supposed that such notions were an autochthonous growth in the mind of this sturdy yeoman. The air was full of them. Unitarianism was not, like the prophet's gourd, the growth of a single night. Any reader of the sermons of that period knows how utterly the real and grand inspiration of Puritanism had deserted the pulpit of Eastern Massachusetts. The clergy was a virtual aristocracy, and, like every privileged class, inclined rather to ease than to action. They naturally favored such doctrines as could be reconciled with a life of comfortable and respectable leisure. For two generations no man had lifted up his voice with the fervor that made Robinson's hearers inquire after every sermon, "Whose heart has the Lord touched to-day?" When Whitefield, more than a century ago, preached with his wonted energy and effect in Cambridge, the faculty of Harvard College printed their testimony against him as a dangerous innovator. Most of the churches were closed to him, and what good was accomplished by his efforts was well-nigh swallowed up in the controversy that ensued on the lawfulness of his itinerant labors. The clergy fell into a reaction against Puritan piety. The deity of Christ, the utter sinfulness of human nature, the atoning character of Christ's sufferings and death, the need and the possibility of regeneration, the eternity of punishment for sin, the consciousness of pardon, the reality of the Spirit's presence with the true Church, all were more or less clearly denied. It was the most natural thing in the world, then, that a man like John Parker should have gleaned up these ideas from sermons in church and from conversation out of it.

Mrs. Parker was not of sufficient intellectual ability to correct these erroneous notions of religion. She admired her husband and shared his views. But she had a natural instinct for

godliness, and under better circumstances might have matched the mothers of Augustine and Wesley or the wife of Edwards. So far as her influence went, it seems to me pure as water and sweet as bread. But I am struck with the absence of certain elements in her religious instruction. She taught her children to say their prayers, and that was all; to read the Scriptures, but not to recognize in them the law of life; to do right, but not their need of righteousness before God. When Theodore was so startled at the voice of conscience she neither told him to pray, nor prayed with him that grace might be ever given him to obey its solemn behests. Such were the mature parents to whom on the 10th of August, 1810, Theodore Parker was born. The father was in his fiftieth year, the mother in her forty-seventh.

The place where he passed his early years could only be attractive to one who had fond associations connected with it. The writer recalls with amusement his only visit, eight years since, to the spot. After a week of those easterly winds and chilly rains that vex the eastern coasts of New England, the weather cleared and nature smiled in sudden gladness. The earth was fragrant with flowers; the heaven was soft and of an unusually deep blue, flecked with fleecy clouds; the brooks were noisier than usual with their sweet bubble; the distant fields beyond Waltham were clad in tender green, which contrasted admirably with the light pinkish tints of the oak groves that lined the hillsides, and choirs of tuneful birds filled the air with various melody; the blackbird, the thrush, and catbird were trilling their best notes; the yellowbird and an occasional meadow-lark were on duty as vocalists; while bobolinks deluged the ear with their rollicking strains. Such was the scene through which the road meandered to the birth-place of Parker. Reaching a crossing, a man and a boy mending the highway were challenged with the inquiry, "Where was Theodore Parker born?" Both leaned on their spades, stared at the traveler, looked at each other, and then the man said, "Dunno." "Are you new-comers here?" "No, sir—lived here man an' boy nigh on to forty year." "Well, are there no Parkers about here?" After consultation the man said, "Yes, there's tew lots on 'em." "I wish to find the *old* Parker place," said the tourist. "Older'n

creation, both on 'em," he responded. "The *Captain Parker* place," the inquirer added. "They run to cappens," said he; "but I guess you had better take that ar road to the left and go about a mile, then turn down a lane, and at the end there's a monnerment that must, be set up for Cappen Parker." "O yes," said I, "he was captain in the Revolution." "Was he? Wial! I dunno; some fellers from Baws'n cum up and did it a while ago." Thus directed the place was soon found, and a sight obtained of the monument set up by the care of John R. Manley to his deceased minister. Verily, the places that know us shall know us no more!

The farm is small and poor. The house is not the one in which Theodore was born, but smaller than that as pictured in Weiss's Life. The old bell-tower remains. The broad ledge, the distant double-headed pine; the ash-tree planted by Theodore, which always bore two crops of leaves until the year of his death and then ceased its freak; the broad meadow, the orchard, and the woods, all were there much as he had known them. But, best of all, Isaac Parker, a brother ten years older than the famous minister, was still there, more than glad to tell all he could remember about his junior's early life. But, as Weiss had seen him, no new facts were elicited from his lips. Yet to see him, to hear him talk of his mother and of Theodore, was truly a revelation. Here was another Parker with all the natural traits of the deceased—prompt and easy speech; warm, quick feelings, that often made the voice husky and the eyes tearful. It was a good place to be born in for bodily and moral health.

Theodore learned to handle tools in his father's shop, and to wield the implements of toil on the farm. Thus were acquired habits of industry, a well-developed frame, and great physical endurance.

The boy was sent to the district school summer and winter until 1817; after that date he attended only the winter sessions. The boy is the man in germ. Theodore was rough and ungainly as a bear in his school-day sports, awkward in behavior, bashful in the presence of strangers, was dreaded on account of his powers of mimicry; he was not beloved by his companions, yet he would not see any body abused. He was no bully. At eight he was one of the greatest readers in town,

had a prodigious memory, and began that course of verse-writing which proved so severe an affliction to his fond biographer. He had already read Rollin, Homer, and Plutarch, all the poetry he could lay hands on, and many odd volumes of history. He began to study Latin when ten years old, and at fifteen had mastered the usual elementary books, with Virgil, Cicero's Select Orations, and Sallust. He began Greek at eleven years, but does not record his progress. Natural philosophy, astronomy, chemistry, and rhetoric, he studied by himself. In his seventeenth year he added algebra to Latin and Greek at the Lexington Academy. Such was his equipment when he began to teach school at Quincy in the winter of 1827. It had been obtained through about three years of solid schooling and an indefinite amount of private study. His father was not able to purchase the books needed by the young scholar, and the latter levied on the whortleberry-bushes for the requisite funds. He taught every winter for four years; after Quincy came North Lexington, then Concord, and finally Waltham. His services on the farm were of no great value to his father during the winter months, and so he was free to teach. When he taught in other seasons of the year he hired a hand to take his place in the field. This was done three several times. At Waltham he began to teach French after taking a very few lessons himself, and afterward he applied himself to Spanish. When just twenty he went to Cambridge to be examined for admission to Harvard College. He was admitted and returned to inform his father. "But, Theodore, you know I cannot support you there!" was the response that greeted him. "I know that, father; I mean to stay at home and keep up with my class." He did so; but, being a non-resident and unable to pay the tuition fees, he was not entitled to the degree of "A.B." The degree of "A.M." was conferred upon him at Harvard in 1840, *honoris causa*.

On the 23d of March, 1831, he came to Boston in fulfillment of an engagement to assist in the instruction of a private school. He transported hither eleven octavo volumes, his entire library, and fell to work with indomitable resolution and energy. He had fifteen dollars a month and his board for teaching Latin, Greek, French, and Spanish, the mathematics, and all sorts of philosophy. He taught six hours a day, and from May to

September seven hours. He boarded in Blossom-street. He hired a man to do his work on the farm from March till August, when he became of age. Thus was he fairly launched on the busy tides of life. He tells Dr. Howe that he used to spend from ten to twelve hours each day in private studies. He also suffered from loneliness and want of affection. A beloved sister passed away, and none came to claim a tender place in his heart. He remained in Boston just one year—whether the engagement was closed on his motion or not we do not know. He next opened a private school in Watertown, where he found much to encourage him—pleasant social relations, the friendship of the Rev. Dr. Francis, the Unitarian clergyman there, and the promise of a wife in Miss Lydia D. Cabot.

There is some difficulty in finding out precisely what he achieved in this or at any subsequent stage of his progress. Had Mr. Weiss spared us eulogy and dissertation to give exact facts he would have laid us under a twofold obligation of gratitude. It is probable, however, that this vagueness of information is the fault of Mr. Parker himself. He had a trick of magnifying real facts with high-sounding phrases, and then drawing on his imagination to an unlimited extent for additional ones. If he has to say that his father was something of a mathematician, he states it thus: "He had studied algebra and geometry, was particularly fond of mathematics, and 'was great at figures.'" That he had a turn for metaphysics is told in these lofty but sphynx-like terms: "He liked metaphysics, psychology, and all departments of intellectual and moral philosophy, and he had read all the English books on philosophy." Here we obtain some notion of the father's attainments, but it would seem that he knew much more than it is at all probable he did. The last phrase undoubtedly tells us all that the father really knew, perhaps more. Of himself Theodore writes, "I read Homer and Plutarch before I was eight, Rollin's Ancient History about the same time, and *lots* of histories, with all the poetry I could find, before ten. I took to metaphysics about eleven or twelve." Weiss writes of him, "He pushed his way to Greece and Rome, and far outread the average for his years." He claims also that he never laid aside any book until he had studied and mastered it. Hardly a page would be required to say what books he

read and when he read them, at this date; such a statement would be of more worth to us than pages of empty declamation.

His college course would not close until the summer of 1834, yet he entered the junior class at the Divinity School in April of that year. Weiss implies on page 47 that his poverty was the sole reason of his not taking his degree, so that he must have completed the usual course of study. Indeed, Mr. Parker writes to Mr. Patterson that he had kept well ahead of his class in college. While this was going on he had also learned German and Hebrew, and meddled with Syriac. He also read "Greek and Latin literature, German metaphysics, as much political economy as he could find, mathematics, theology, and missal reading." Alas, that we knew just what he did read, and just how well he understood it! It seems unfair, after such vague talk from Mr. Parker, that Weiss should march him up and down on his own account before the well-filled shelves of Dr. Francis's library and trumpet out this unmeaning phrase: "Here, then, were *Dogmatik*, *Metaphysik*, and *Hermeneutik* for Theodore." And just as he left Watertown for the Divinity School, Weiss records that, "During the school-keeping he read Tacitus, Cicero, Herodotus, and Thucydides, and translated Pindar, Theocritus, Bion and Moschus, as well as Æschylus. He fell in with Cousin and the new school of French philosophers, and became acquainted with Coleridge. He also pursued the study of the literature of all the modern languages he then knew, (that is, French, Spanish, and German,) and made great strides in metaphysics and theology."

He entered the Theological School on the first day of April, 1834. He says that he had hesitated somewhat before taking this step. He had even made some preliminary studies looking toward the law as a profession. He was repelled by the doctrines which were taught in the pulpits, the notorious dullness of Sunday services, and the fact that the clergy did not lead in the intellectual, moral, or religious progress of the people. He says that Dr. Channing was the only man in the New England pulpit who seemed to him great. This account was written a little before his death. It is curious to compare all this with the references in his journal and letters to men like Francis, Norton, Palfrey, Stuart, Dewey, and Ware. It

is plain that in this account of his experience as a minister Parker continually substitutes his later conclusions for his early impressions. The account of the three questions which he asked and answered seems like an afterthought, stilted and artificial as the Masonic ritual. In certain cases we can detect great discrepancies between the statements contained in this document and the real facts. For example, among the "five distinct denials" of the popular theology with which he alleges that he entered upon his theological education, the first is "the ghastly doctrine of eternal damnation and a wrathful God." This he states that he made way with somewhere from his seventh to his tenth year. But he had forgotten the confession of his faith which he made in a letter to his nephew, Columbus Greene, on the second day of April, 1834. There he says, "I believe in a God . . . who will reward the good and punish the wicked, both in this life and the next. This punishment may be eternal."

The third "distinct denial" runs thus: "I had found no evidence which to me could authorize a belief in the supernatural birth of Jesus of Nazareth. The twofold biblical testimony was all; that was contradictory and good for nothing; we had not the affidavit of the mother, the only competent human witness, nor even the declaration of the Son; there was no circumstantial evidence to confirm the statement of the Gospels of a most improbable event."

In the letter to Greene he says, "I believe that Christ was the Son of God, conceived and born in a miraculous manner." Weiss also gives a quotation, on page 82, vol. i, of his *Life*, apparently from the *Journal*: "I do not doubt that Jesus was a man 'sent from God,' and endowed with power from on high, that he taught the truth and worked miracles." This was in 1835 or later. Indeed, he wavers a good deal on this head for some years more. In June, 1839, he speaks of Christ's miracle-working power as something natural to him and to the human race. Parker thinks he has himself felt something of it. He deems it not contrary to nature but above it. More than a year later he tells Miss Peabody, "I have no doubt that Jesus wrought miracles." It seems, then, that he had not even then gained the conception of God which "makes miracles as impossible as a round square."

The fourth "distinct denial" is thus stated: "Many miracles related in the Old and New Testaments seemed incredible to me; some were clearly impossible and others were wicked. Such, of course, I rejected at once, while I arbitrarily admitted others." Weiss quotes from him in 1835 or 1836 as follows: "Mr. Dewey gave us the Dudleyan lecture this year. It was the best, perhaps, that I have ever heard, though upon the least interesting part of the Evidences of Revealed Religion, namely, miracles. He removed the presumption against them—the objections were not only met but *overturned*." Dr. Dewey was hardly a leader in the New England pulpit, yet here is a note on him which shows whether Parker then thought Channing the only great man among the New England clergy, "Ah me! what an infinite distance between me and such men" as Dr. Dewey!

The fifth "distinct denial" is thus stated: "I had no belief in the plenary, infallible, verbal inspiration of the whole Bible, and strong doubts as to the *miraculous* inspiration of any part of it." Yet he tells Greene, "I believe the books of the Old and New Testaments to have been written by men inspired by God for certain purposes, but I do not think them inspired at all times."

These are very singular freaks for any man's memory to play, but they are still harder to account for in one who styles his a "memory that holds all things firm as gravitation, and yet, like that, keeps them unmixed, not confusing the most delicate outline, and reproduces them at will, complete in the whole and perfect in each part." The truth is, that the so-called Experience of Theodore Parker as a Minister is almost entirely untrustworthy when not corroborated by independent testimony. It seems rather his experience as it should have been than his experience as it really was. So grave an assertion would not be made if confirmation were not at hand. We have just seen that in his twenty-fourth year Parker still believed in the punishment of sin in the future world, and that he thought such punishments might be eternal. The letter to Greene goes back to the very time of his admission into the Cambridge Divinity School. In several places Mr. Parker has described a crisis of his early religious life in regard to the doctrine of future and endless punishment. This is its form in

one of his sermons: "I once knew a boy of early development in religion, dry-nursed at school, against his father's command, on the New England Primer, and he was filled with ghastly fear of the God represented in that Primer, and the hell thereof and the devil therein, and he used to sob himself to sleep with the prayer, 'O God! I beg that I may not be damned,' until at last, before he was eight years old, driven to desperation by that fear, he made way with that Primer, and with its grim God, and hell, and devil, and found rest for his soul in the spontaneous teachings of the religious sentiment that sprang up in his breast." Of course this has an autobiographic air; yet there are some strange facts to be connected with the account. In his Experience he affirms that he had such an early struggle over the dogma of endless retribution, and adds, "From my seventh year I had *no fear of God*, only an ever-greatening love and trust." The crisis described, then, occurred before his eighth year. Now it is singular that in his autobiography, which comes down to his eighth year, no mention is made of this fact. He discusses his early moral development then, and yet omits this event, one of its most striking features. How could he have attended Dr. Beecher's ministry for a whole year, and gone through one of his revivals, when teaching in Boston in 1831, after he had passed through such a crisis? It might be supposed that Dr. Beecher had disturbed his complacent rejection of this awful dogma, did not Parker expressly say the opposite: "I went through one of his 'protracted meetings,' listening to the fiery words of excited men, and hearing the most frightful doctrines set forth in sermon, song, and prayer. . . . But I came away with no confidence in his theology. The better I understood it, the more self-contradictory, unnatural, and hateful did it seem. A year of his preaching about finished all the respect I had for the Calvinistic scheme of theology." Assuming the truth of this account, how came he to write, two years after he had ceased to hear Beecher, that he still believed in the dogma of future punishment, and that he thought it might be eternal? So far as I can find, Parker first made the record of this painful struggle in 1839, when he surely had rejected the dogma of eternal retribution; it next appears in a sermon published in 1853, was next alluded to as a fact of his own history

in a letter to Mr. Senkler, and finally reaffirmed in his letter from Santa Cruz. If a fourfold averment of any fact has any worth, Mr. Parker is pledged for the veracity of his recital; if a forgotten letter can convict its writer of mistake, the letter to Mr. Greene performs that service for Parker. There could have been no motive for misstatement when the letter was written; but the account of the "crisis" was employed as an argument against a doctrine he hated. It seems like an invention. Such sobbings of fear, followed by such joyful confidence in the falsity of the rejected doctrines, are hardly a consistent prelude to what is contained in the letter to Greene.

At the theological school Parker made a marked impression. He was full of odd information, and crammed with facts picked up from books and observation. He was grotesque and frolicsome; was given to anger somewhat, but more to despondency. He was obliged to resolve to restrain licentiousness of imagination, which contains many things not to be committed to paper, lest the paper blush. Alas, Mr. Weiss, that he had "no sins to speak of!" He prayed with pious feeling, and talked about answers to his prayers. He wrote very poor sermons, and Professor Ware's frank criticisms of them reduced him to despair. But he excelled in debate, and loved it with the zest of a born disputant. In discussion he used to call Paul the apostle, "Old Paul;" and, when checked for his irreverence, mended the matter by substituting the words, "The gentleman from Tarsus."

He obtained the reputation of being a prodigious student. Some of his classmates asserted that he studied fourteen hours a day. He speaks of studying from ten to twelve hours a day when he was teaching six or seven hours. At West Roxbury, he says he found it a pleasure to work from ten to fifteen hours in his study. James Freeman Clarke, who had some chance to know, tells us that he wrought from six to twelve hours daily; and a writer in the "Atlantic Monthly" declares that he has Parker's word that he used to toil from twelve to seventeen hours daily among his books. We leave Mr. Weiss to settle these discrepancies. The account of his doings at the seminary is interesting. He resolved to "sleep six hours at least, seven certainly, and eight very often, to avoid excess in food and drink, and to spend three hours daily in the open air."

Weiss infers that he usually obtained less than six hours' sleep, though there is no ground, save Weiss's pleasure, for thinking so. The school exercises required eleven hours of his time per week. He sometimes taught private pupils as many hours more in the week.

Now let us see what he did while in the school. He read the Fathers, and made careful notes and analyses of their works. The Fathers of the Church, prior to the Council of Nice, make up eighteen goodly volumes, as published by T. & T. Clark. But there are manifest signs that he read some of the Post-Nicene Fathers. The Catholic and High-Church parties usually embrace the Christian writers of the first six centuries under this title. The Oxford edition consists of forty volumes. The vacation of 1834 was wholly spent in translating papers on La Fayette for Mr. Sparks. Here were two months gone. He spent a month of his last term on a visit to Washington. The poetic faculty kept up its proclamation of utter imaginative bankruptcy in legions of dreary verses. He translated, dipped into rabbinical matters, read books on the Messianic prophecies, and was favorably inclined to De Wette's views on this subject. He also asked himself some questions concerning the miraculous conception. He studied books on the Canon and the different versions of the Bible, translated the article on Rationalism from the *Conversations-Lexicon*, and also considerable matter from Eichhorn's *Ur-Geschichte*. Paulus succeeded, and a paper was written called *Hints on German Theology*. Next he went through the "*Wolfenbüttel Fragments*," and began to read Spinoza. Under the caption, *Horæ Platoniceæ*, analyses and criticisms on views contained in Plato's works are given. Sundays he used to walk to Charlestown to teach a Sunday-school class in the State-prison. Notes on Coleridge's *Table-Talk* follow. He read Wegscheider, Staudlin, Storr, Schmidt, Cudworth, Henry More, Norris, Descartes, Lessing, Cousin, B. Constant, Leibnitz, and, finally, the words, "books on magic, in which he was very curious," suggest numberless muddy tomes. He read Vico's *Scienza Nuova*, studied Ammon's "*Fortbildung*," and some Greek comedies, German commentaries, some volumes of De Wette, Kant, and a great many books on Gnosticism. The last was the subject of his graduating essay. He spent much of his time after the

middle of 1835 in writing for and editing "The Scriptural Investigator," a periodical published by students of the Divinity School. His contributions to this magazine number forty. The most important was an essay on the Laws of Moses, very highly commended by Mr. Weiss, but not read by the present writer. This paper extended through several numbers. Here he also published a translation of Astruc's Conjectures on Genesis, though not without fears that it would cause some outcry. Eight of the fourteen months in which Parker read three hundred and twenty volumes belong to this period.

Besides this account, based upon manuscript documents, we find another equally curious from Parker's pen in the Experience as a Minister. He says that during the three years preceding his settlement at West Roxbury he "read the Bible critically in the original tongues, and the most important parts of it also in the early versions." "I studied the historical development of religion among nations not Christian or Jewish, and attended as well as I then could to the four other great religious sects: the Brahmanic, Buddhistic, the Classic, and the Mohammedan. As far as possible at that time I studied the sacred books of mankind in their original tongues, and with the help of the most faithful interpreters. Here the Greek and Roman poets and philosophers came in for their place, there being no sacred books of the Classic nations. I attended pretty carefully to the religion of savages and barbarians. . . . I found no tribe of men destitute of religion who had attained power of articulate speech." He also names Locke, Hobbes, Berkeley, Hume, Paley, the French Materialists, Reid, Stewart, Butler, and Barrow, as giving him little help in his effort "to make an analysis of humanity, to see if I could detect the special element that produced religious consciousness in me, and religious phenomena in mankind." Kant aided him most, but, poor fellow! "he did not always furnish conclusions I could rest in; . . . yet gave me the true method, and put me on the right road." With much reading and protracted meditation, then, he found certain great primal intuitions of human nature, of which he gives us the three most important to religion:

"1. The instinctive intuition of the divine; the consciousness that there is a God.

"2. The instinctive intuition of the just and right; a consciousness that there is a moral law, independent of our will, which we ought to keep.

"3. The instinctive intuition of the immortal; the consciousness of eternal life.

"I thought it a triumph that I had . . . devised a scheme which to the scholar's mind, I thought, would legitimate what was spontaneously given to all by the great primal instincts of mankind. Then I proceeded to develop the contents of these instinctive intuitions of the divine, the just and the immortal, and see what God actually is, what morality is, and what eternal life has to offer. First, from the history of mankind, savage, barbarous, civilized, and enlightened, I gathered the most significant facts I could find relating to men's opinions about God, morality, heaven, and hell, and thence made such generalizations as the facts would warrant, which, however, were seldom satisfactory. . . .

"Next, from the primitive facts of consciousness, as given by the power of instinctive intuition, I endeavored to deduce the true notion of God, justice, and futurity. Here I could draw on human nature, and not be hindered by the limitations of human history. I studied books on sleep-walking, dreams, visions, prophecies, second-sight, oracles, ecstasies, witchcraft, magic wonders, the appearance of devils, ghosts, and the like; also the Pseudepigraphy of the Old Testament and the apocraphy of the New, with the strange fantasies of the Neplatonists. . . . I did not neglect the Mystics."

We shall presently show that this work, if done at all before his first settlement, must have been done ere Parker left the Theological School. I might fairly pause here to ask if there can be time to do more work than this in the twenty-four months spent by Parker in theological study at the school? Those months are—seven hundred and twenty days. Suppose Parker studied fourteen hours per day, we have ten thousand two hundred and twenty hours. Let any man, the abler the better, consider whether as much work has not been assigned to this space of time as can be well performed in it. I have taken no notice of the fact that his plan of study provides for only eleven to thirteen hours of daily study; nor have I made any allowance for Sunday, from a feeling that Parker made

none. In a letter to George Ripley, Parker says that he has not told all about the studies of this period, and Weiss throws out similar hints.

But there is more to come. Parker was a great linguist. Considering how much else he had done, we are somewhat surprised to find that on entering the Divinity School he claimed a good acquaintance with French, Spanish, German, Hebrew, Latin, Greek, and a "little Syriac." Eight languages, including his vernacular—no poor equipment for a young man of twenty-four. But in the school he made the most startling progress. Twelve languages were added to his store during the two years of his stay. Here is the list given by Weiss: Italian, Portuguese, Dutch, Icelandic, Chaldaic, Arabic, Persian, Coptic, Swedish, Danish, modern Greek, and Anglo-Saxon. Besides these he gets a smatter of Ethiopic, and attempts the Russian; the last was given up for want of somebody to teach him the sounds of the letters. This smatter of Ethiopic, shows what Mr. Parker thought of his attainments in the other languages of this list. It is a suspicious fact that Theodore came to Cambridge with a "little Syriac," but was soon so "nice" in his acquaintance with it as to be consulted by Professor Willard on certain difficult points. The truth is that accurate scholarship was not his gift. Mr. Senkler corrects his Greek. He boasted to Dr. Howe that he knew how to write French, Spanish, and German. We have been able to find no specimen of his German. When writing to German friends he sometimes drops in a German word with his English, but never ventures upon a full sentence. When he attempts an Italian phrase, a Spanish word drops in unperceived, and eludes the notice of his affectionate biographer. When he sprinkles his account of his broken umbrella on the route from Avignon to Arles, he says, "*Madame Fumneau* had *se mit sur la*, and it was *cassée*; therefore *voilà ma parapluie cassée*." This can hardly be called a French sentence; for the *voilà*, in spite of the vigilance of Parker and his editor, has slipped off its proper accent, while the *se mit sur la* defies translation until M. Réville has corrected it for French readers. I know that these are small matters, but they are just such as Sainte Beuve brought against the Latin scholarship of Pontmartin, and of which he declared that they are decisive of the question of nice scholarship.

Indeed, it could not be otherwise. Mr. Parker read too much, his life through, to read well; he attempted too many languages to know any accurately. Mr. Weiss, however, writes that "all languages, dead and living, were mastered with great rapidity. . . . He learned not merely the vocabulary of a new tongue, as so many American students do, to get at the general sense of a book in the most economical manner, and push over the ground with smart conjectures, but he loved philology; the grammatical structure and derivation of a language attracted him first. The vocabulary came next."

This praise is lavished on a man who is said to have added to his stock of languages a fresh one every two months, at a time when he was surrounded with all sorts of work. If we are to believe this at all, we must believe it, with Tertullian, because it is impossible; and yet these incredible tales rest upon the testimony of Mr. Parker himself. In a letter to Miss Cabot he claims acquaintance with some twenty languages. I think this account must be taken with very large allowances for the temper which led to the assertion of his early rejection of the dogma of endless perdition.

To show that these studies must have been conducted, if at all, prior to his graduation in 1836, careful note will now be taken of his proceeding between that date and the next June, when he became pastor of West Roxbury. On August 6 we find him at Barnstable, where he remains four weeks, writes several sermons, and reads before half that time is gone about a dozen books; all he has with him, in fact. August 11, he begins to translate Dr. Wette's *Einleitung*. He reads Shelling's lectures on Academical Study, and finds them too ideal. In October he is preaching in Northfield, Mass., where he declines to settle. In November he preaches at Barnstable again, where he avoids a call. In December he supplies Dr. Flint's pulpit in Salem. He studies the English State Trials, and analyzes the great speeches contained in them. From these he learned method. He is in Northfield in January, 1837, candidates in Greenfield in February, preaches a good deal in Salem during the spring months, is married April 20, finishes his translation of De Wette May 20, is settled, June 23, at Spring-street, and has the revision of his translation of De Wette nearly completed July 13. The merest inspection

will show not only that his mode of life was unfavorable to study, but also that he had more than enough to busy his mind with.

There can be no doubt that the confusion which prevails in the accounts of his life at this period is mainly due to Parker's habit of exaggeration; but the evil is aggravated by the credulous temper of Mr. Weiss himself. Had he been careful to examine into the gross and palpable contradictions with which this part of his volume is crowded, we might have obtained some more consistent and probable record of these years. But when a biographer talks of a man of such manifold public labors as Parker was, as knowing "so well the contents of each volume of the twelve thousand" in his library, or tells us that "there was not a book in the whole vast collection which did not at some time serve his practical turn," what confidence can he expect? Read twelve thousand such volumes and die at forty-nine, after so active a life as Parker's became about 1846! What Bollandist was ever more credulous than Weiss? Here is the mythical tendency in strange company.

This exhibition of a disposition to exaggeration in Mr. Parker is not made for any purpose of depreciation. His life, career, and character cannot be understood unless we grasp this fundamental vice of his nature. Its influence we shall presently discern in many ways.

Parker was very far from having reached the conclusions he asserts he had gained before he settled in West Roxbury. It is refreshing to notice the modest tone of his letters, writings, and conversations as they appear in Weiss's account of that period, based on documents which date from it, as compared with the superior and triumphant air of the *Experience*. He talks with Norton, Stuart, and Channing without the least suspicion how much less is their intellectual stature than his. The lists of questions given by Weiss on pages 95 and 121 (the latter under the date of 1839) show that Mr. Parker was then groping dimly on his way to his ultimate position, but was far from having reached it.

After his ordination, June 23, 1837, life went on quietly enough with the young minister. He liked to write sermons, preach them, was one of the school committee, and grew

familiar with his audience of from seventy to one hundred and fifty persons. He presided over "Olympics" made up chiefly of lady friends, where Goethe, Bettini, G nderode, Norton, Fourier, Emerson, the Dial, and Parker's own verses, were discussed. Weiss, with his usual magnificent vagueness of phrase, adds to these themes "all cosmic questions." Parker reads Jacobi, old Henry More, Bulwer's Athens, The Life of Apollonius Tyaneus, studies ethics extensively, and begins to write for the periodicals. We have glimpses of him at a certain society of "Friends of Progress," where Hedge, Ripley, Wendell Phillips, Alcott, and Dr. Follen, are sometimes seen. He visits Norton, whom he still respects as learned and able, and their conversation is about Schleiermacher. We may guess how much he understands of German theology by the fact that he is quite unable to correct the Professor's false ideas of him. Moses Stuart surprises him with unexpected liberality of thought. Dr. Channing he considers the leader of the movement-party among the Unitarians. Parker had intended to become a reformer when he was settled in West Roxbury. This intention he keeps steadily in view. The beginning is made by venting his speculations in sermons to a congregation not sufficiently versed in theology to ask him any perplexing questions. "I preach abundant heresies, and they all go down, for the hearers don't know how heretical they are. I preach the worst of all things, transcendentalism itself, the grand heresy." This citation is the more important because it reveals the source of an influence very potent with him in these days. Mr. Emerson was as sphynx-like then as now, and many a hot dispute raged over his alleged Pantheism. Indeed, the air was rife with new notions; even Parker was shocked to hear Alcott talking about "the progress of God." But Emerson's notions about the self-sufficing nature of the soul began to affect his thoughts. This appears in his suspicion that he had been too great an admirer of Dr. Channing. It also crops out in his conversations with the latter. He is already breaking away from Channing's influence. Though he discusses with him the views of Strauss and other theological novelties, and finds him inclined to loose notions about the Sabbath, whenever a difference of opinion arises Channing appears a conservative and Parker a radical. When the former commends Parker's arti-

cle in the "Christian Examiner" on Ackerman's book, *Das Christliche im Plato*, he suggests the query whether it does justice to Christian morality as an advance on all other systems. When Channing says conscience needs to be educated, Parker laughs at the idea as absurd; when Channing, evidently thinking of the Bible, says we need an infallible guide, Parker responds that the conscience, or rather the soul, is one. Channing advises Parker not to translate Strauss's *Leben Jesu*, in a way that evidences a doubt lest he might be tempted to do it. While Parker, under the lead of Strauss, is learning to think of Jesus as a simple man, Channing holds that he had a miraculous character different in kind from ours. While Parker is sure that the writers of the New Testament had no inspiration different in kind from that of all good men, and that Jesus Christ only had more of the same kind that Socrates had, Channing believes that the Saviour had a revelation such as was enjoyed by none else save the old prophets. The tendency of Parker's mind is wholly in this direction. In 1837 he has read Strauss, and says, as he had lately been wont to, that the Old Testament miracles are absurd; but he now adds, for the first time, that the New Testament miracles, as prophecies, dreams, and miraculous births, are no less so. He admits a mythical element in the New Testament, though rather in the sense of Gobler and Bauer than that of Strauss. In 1838 he deems the scourge of small cords, the fish with the tribute-money, the cursing of the fig-tree, and the stories of the ascension pure fables; he also thinks Jesus or his disciples mistaken about the approaching end of the world. The same line of thought was powerfully stimulated by hearing Emerson's address in 1839 before the Divinity School. This memorable event is worthy of having all the light we can command thrown upon it. Under date of July 15, 1839, Parker writes: "I proceeded to Cambridge to hear Mr. Emerson's valedictory sermon. My soul is roused, and this week I shall write the long-meditated sermons on the state of the Church and the duties of these times." From this time the influence of Channing with him sensibly waned, and that of Emerson grew silently to vast power. Signs of an approaching conflict begin to show themselves. Parker's article in the "Boston Quarterly Review" on Palfrey's Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and

Antiquities, was of such a temper that people said his motive was blasphemous, and the best informed thought it the work of an atheist.

January, 1840, he preached the Thursday lecture on Inspiration. This was a delicate theme, and was handled without ceremony by Mr. Parker, now well on his way to that lord-of-all-I-survey style of treatment which grew so conspicuous in him toward the meridian of his career. His views had become such as to lead him to talk about the folly of thinking that the divine goodness had exhausted itself, and the probability that new Christs would be manifested among mankind. His spirit was deemed sarcastic and unchristian, which charge he ever denied with indignation. Yet he says that his own hair stood on end at the thought of what he had written. It was about the same period that a warm-hearted and clear-headed woman pronounced him a downright infidel. The question was also raised whether it was right to allow Emerson the name of Christian in view of his peculiar dogmatic utterances. Parker said "yes;" but Parker knew that he was in like condemnation. He began to assert that we might equal, or even transcend, Jesus Christ in spiritual insight and moral excellence, and he sought the most offensive way of saying so by bidding harlots strive after a perfection which should far surpass that of our Saviour. Of course it was logical and natural enough for him on such principles to say that one might shed a tear over the weakness of Jesus, and to affirm that John Augustus, a distant relative of his, had shown a greater love for the poor and vicious than Jesus of Nazareth, if the records of the evangelists are to be trusted. He attended the Chardon-street Convention, held in November, 1840. This meeting was called to discuss the ministry, the Sabbath, and the Church. Men of all shades of opinion were invited, under the management of Edmund Quincy, to share in the deliberations. Parker was advised by Channing to keep clear of the affair, but was bent on going. Of course the convention was a motley throng, and the extremists took virtual possession of the meeting. No candid and thoughtful believer had much chance of a hearing, and a disreputable fame hangs over the convention. Parker seems to have taken no active part in their discussions; but a record in his journal shows that he

meant to push his peculiar notions: "I have my own doctrines and shall support them, think the convention as it may."

The method of his reform was already growing clear to his own mind. He had begun by setting the soul above the Church and the Bible, and he must bring all things into harmony with such a position. The authority of the sacred Scriptures seemed a great obstacle to the success of these new views. Yet these views were working in him with the violence of new wine. He takes a lingering view of certain Christian dogmas which find powerful demonstration in the facts of human nature and history. The problem of evil must be confronted, and it seemed unlikely to favor his new ideas. The various diseases, deformities, and monstrosities which are presented in the animal world, the malignant aspect of a great part of the activity of men and beasts, and the terribly significant fact of death, all startle his mind. The apparent viciousness of brutes and the real viciousness of men are sad puzzles to him. If the simple truth must be told, Parker carefully evaded a thorough treatment of this question. He had declared it as his intention to clear theology of mythology and then apply good sense to it, so as to obtain a system which should be founded on facts of necessity, facts of consciousness, and facts of observation. We have a chance to see how he did this in relation to the fact of moral evil. He believed in a perfectly powerful, just, and good God. This knowledge he deemed intuitive and absolutely certain, and hence God can only create a world or universe that shall express and illustrate these qualities. But here is the actual world so full of seeming contradictions of these qualities that it appears an express refutation of these singular statements. But Parker is not daunted by such trifles. He concludes from his conception of God that the world *must be* perfect; that physical evils must be helps to our progress, errors the shortest and surest cuts to truth, and a proper and rapid experience in sin the sure mark of moral progress and growing purity. It is true, he modestly concedes that it is somewhat difficult to legitimate all this in the court of the understanding, indeed it may be found impossible; still he is sure of its truth. He tells us about the same period, "I think sin leaves little mark on the soul; for, first, much of it is to be referred to causes that are external even to

the physical man ; and, second, much to the man's organism. I think ninety-nine hundredths of all sins thus explicable." The winter before he died he wrote from Rome a letter to the Rev. James Freeman Clarke which shows that he had long ere that time ceased to treat this gravest of moral questions seriously. "Sin," he says, "commonly called ngsinn-n-n, has no existence." With him, as with Plato, it is of the nature of error. He makes his way to such a startling conclusion the easier by endeavoring to persuade himself that human freedom, if it exist at all in moral conduct, has a very narrow range, and that abnormal moral conduct is as sure to be brought back to righteousness as the stones we cast at the sky are of being pulled down by gravitation. Of course such ideas cut him off from any serious condemnation of sin in others. They led him to say that the harlot who plied her infamous trade in the nearest bagnio was perhaps better in the sight of God than himself, made him transport men like Webster and Choate, after pronouncing the severest judgment on their morals and political courses, at once to the heaven of eternal love. They would have softened, and in many instances did soften, his denunciations of the rumseller, the slave-trader, slaveholder, slave-commissioner, or doughface politician. In all consistency he ought to have said to himself, Such men are not very bad, after all ; their faults are the results of their circumstances ; they are rather to be pitied than blamed. He often did talk thus ; but when he was confronted with such a sinner he seemed a living fury of vengeance. He was nobly inconsistent with his own creed, and makes one think of Zeno, whose slave was being punished for theft : "Why whip me, since it was fated that I should steal?" "Because it was also fated that you should be whipped."

It is perfectly clear that Mr. Parker had got quite beyond the tenets of Unitarianism, and equally plain that he meant to make the new gospel ring in the ears of men. In 1840 he writes, "For my own part, I am determined in the coming year to let out all the force of transcendentalism that is in me. Come what will come, I will let off the truth as fast as it comes. . . . How my own thought troubles me ! I have a work to do, and how am I straitened till it is accomplished ! I must write an Introduction to the New Testament, showing

the distinctive and universal part of Christianity—a philosophy of man, showing the foundation for religion in him. Then the crown of theology, defining the relation of God and man. I must do or die.” In this exalted mood he resolves to write immediately a sermon on Idolatry, and he minutes the points that he intends to discuss. These will help us to detect the drift of his meditations. After a few well-delivered blows at mammon and love of a good name, he uncovers the real objects of the discourse by saying that the Church makes an idol of the Bible; that it loves Jesus Christ as God though he is not God; that the Church, ministry, and Sabbath are regarded as divine institutions, though they are merely human. Weiss is right in saying that Parker planned his movements on such subjects with care and deliberation. He thought the hour had come for a revolution in theology, and he meant to have a conspicuous share in its accomplishment.

On the 19th of May, 1841, the Rev. C. C. Shackford was ordained pastor of the Hawes Place Church in South Boston. Mr. Parker had been invited to preach the ordination sermon. Though his sermon was poorly conceived, and not very well written, it was destined to become famous. Its subject is *The Transient and the Permanent in Christianity*. It was a new and not very vigorous statement of the points in which its author thought a reform in theology demanded. The words of Jesus, so far as they express truth, will not pass away, but the rites of Christianity may be changed; the false science which has been represented as a part of the truth contained in the Scriptures will be rejected; the popular theology will vanish; doctrines will change, for they have changed. Here are given as illustrations the common doctrines of the origin and authority of the Old and New Testaments. This idolatry of the Old Testament did not always exist, and modern criticism is destroying it. So of the New Testament, it must give way. The ordinary notions of inspiration have no basis in the Bible. Its modest authors would be confounded at our idolatry of them. So of the dogmas relating to the nature and authority of Christ. The sects base Christianity on the personal authority of Jesus, not on absolute truth. Why not the axioms of geometry on the authority of Euclid or Archimedes? Opinions on the nature of Christ are constantly changing, and so are not

fundamentally related to Christianity. In all the discourse Jesus is treated as a mere man; a lofty soul, indeed, inspired beyond all others of his time and of any time, faithful to himself and others, but nothing more. There was no marked stir during the delivery of the discourse, only the venerable clergyman who made the ordaining prayer besought the Throne of Grace that the young candidate might always have a living faith in a Son of God of divine nature and work. It seemed that the affair was to go by without any noise. It was a rash thing, to be sure, for the preacher to say openly in public, and perhaps before the evangelicals, what he might freely say in private to as many as he pleased. Entire mental and moral freedom was the Unitarian rule, and, provided it was prudently observed, no harm would be done.

But the terrible orthodox were there. The South Boston blasphemy was noised abroad. The press discussed it at length, and, delicate as was their position, the Unitarians would perhaps have borne with the rash offender but for the effect on the public. The orthodox had always said that such would be the end of the Unitarian heresy. They now congratulated themselves on their skill in prophecy. The lines were drawn at last so that every body could see whither Socinianism was leading public opinion. It was no longer possible to doubt that the issue would be Deism or Christianity. Parker was right in asserting that he was acting on principles acknowledged by all his party; yet he was unreasonable in supposing that all would see this. Many of them, doubtless, did not believe it. All felt the singularly awkward position his sermon put them in toward the orthodox. On the whole, the Unitarians behaved very badly. They had no right to ostracise Parker, to refuse him recognition on the street, to rise up from the sofa where he had taken a seat, nor to refuse his hand when offered in salutation. However, it is not safe to disturb the dignity of human nature even in dainty Unitarians, unless you are willing to risk an astonishing exhibition of human depravity. So Mr. Parker found to his cost. His connection with them could only be an embarrassment to them and a discomfort to himself; yet, on the pretext that the rights of free thought and free speech were involved in the question, he refused to withdraw from them, as they would gladly have seen him do. They

refused to expel him from their association, and thus afford him the attitude of persecution and the moral advantages which attend that sort of martyrdom. These he earnestly coveted; these they constantly refused to give him. You think yourselves aggrieved, he said; very well, the remedy is in your own hands—expel me. We are aggrieved, they said; but we cannot afford to confer on you in the public estimation the canonization of martyrdom. Both were wrong. Parker should have separated from their fellowship when he discovered that he had strayed beyond the limits of permissible heresy. They should have enforced upon him the natural consequences of the position which he had voluntarily assumed. But as neither party had the courage to accept the situation, the public witnessed the singular comedy of an ecclesiastical offender begging for ecclesiastical execution, and of an ecclesiastical inquisition persistently avoiding its office. It is curious to see how eager Parker and his friends were for some blunder on the part of his opponents which would relieve his position by awakening some sympathy for him in the public mind. Under date of June 13, 1841, the Rev. Dr. Francis writes, "I find there is a great hue and cry over Parker's sermon at the ordination of Mr. Shackford: he is accused of infidelity, etc.,—the old song over again,—and one writer in the 'Puritan' recommends that he be prosecuted under the laws of the Commonwealth against blasphemy! Bravo! So mote it be! Would to God they would try their hand at this!" etc. Alas, that a preacher of the dignity of human nature should stoop to write such lines!

Nobody would persecute him or prosecute him, so as to give him the airs of a martyr; but for ecclesiastical and civil ostracism social proscription was substituted. People ceased to know him, ministers refused to exchange with him; he found the journals shut against him, and an effort was made to reduce him to silence. Even Dr. Francis canceled a contemplated exchange. A few stood by him with courage. His bearing under all this evil treatment was not very noble. He whined, complained that some who secretly thought as he did held a different language in public. No doubt there was some ground for all this, but he should have expected it and been prepared for it. But he was evidently taken by surprise that,

instead of heading the Unitarian advance, he had been rudely thrust over among the devil's own. There was then, as ever, something weak and sickly in his temper; as Bartol says, "he had the disease of a sore personality." As I have read and weighed his own references to this event in letters and pamphlets, the conviction has steadily grown upon me that Parker had not the inward support required to maintain an unruffled temper under such severe trials. When John Wesley had passed through the great spiritual struggles which ended in that settled and unbroken serenity which marked his life from its thirty-fifth year to the close, he, too, soon found the pulpits of his Church closed against him. He believed that he was only renewing the pure doctrines of the earlier and better days of the English Church, and reviving the decayed piety of a fallen generation. He did not say that unless he could obtain a hearing elsewhere he would scour the land on preaching-tours, but instantly and without a murmur fled to the high-ways, the hillsides, and the moors, to proclaim his joyful faith. At length Wesley came to Oxford to officiate in his turn before the University. It was the season of the races, and many strangers were in town. Such was the state of public opinion that clergymen, gownsmen, and learned professors joined with sportsmen and the rabble in the excitements of the turf. The fame of the great field-preacher had awakened a widespread desire to hear him. At Christ Church Charles Wesley found men in surplices at morning prayers talking, laughing, and pointing as if at a play; but at St. Mary's, where John preached, the scene was very different. The assembly was very large, and the services solemn. The sermon was an earnest plea for spiritual life and practical holiness after the model of the New Testament. It was as novel language to that careless generation as Mr. Parker's was to any of his South Boston hearers. Every word was carefully heard. Wesley thought he should not be permitted to speak there again, and made the most of the occasion. The Vice-Chancellor sent a message after him and desired his notes. They were sealed up and delivered to him. In his journal Wesley writes, "I preached, I suppose, for the last time at St. Mary's. Be it so. I am clear of the blood of these men. I have fully delivered my own soul." He remembers that it is St. Bartholomew's day,

and is glad that this event has befallen him on the very day on which, in the preceding century, near two thousand burning and shining lights were quenched. He meditates: "What a difference between their case and mine. They were turned out of house and home and all they had, whereas I am only hindered from preaching, without any other loss, and in a kind of honorable manner, it being determined that when my next turn to preach comes they will pay a person to preach for me." How serene and manly, not to say pious, is this temper! And yet the offense against Mr. Wesley was of precisely the same nature as that over which Parker whimpered, cried, and broke off old friendships, while the offense of the former was infinitely less.

Parker returned to his little parish at West Roxbury, where, however the storm might rage elsewhere, he always found peace. It speaks well for him that all attempts to alienate the affections of his parishioners failed. They were his firm and constant friends. In this quiet abode he continued to study, read, think, and find domestic happiness; yet his eye watched the movement of the storm he had raised, and ever and anon he intervened in the conflict. He was evidently resolved to secure a hearing and compel a careful attention to his views. He begins to suspect that to continue in West Roxbury will be virtually to be buried alive. He keeps an open eye for a better chance to make the world listen to him. Various schemes for the accomplishment of this plan occupied his thoughts. Here is one: "I will study seven or eight months in the year, and four or five months I will go about and preach and lecture in city and glen, wherever men and women can be found. I will go eastward and westward, northward and southward, and make the land *ring*; and if this New England theology that cramps the intellect and cramps the soul of us does not come to the ground, then it shall be because it has more truth in it than I have ever found."

Obviously a man of this temper would have a hearing in some form. Early in May, 1842, he sent the last sheet of his Discourse of Religion to the printer, and in somewhat more than a twelvemonth later his translation of De Wette's Introduction followed. As he found himself very much exhausted with these and other labors, he resolved on a year's travel in Europe. Mr. Russell, one of his parishioners, furnished the needful

funds, and accordingly he sailed from New York on the 9th of September, 1843. Before we follow him on his journey let us consider the Discourse of Religion and some other subsidiary matters.

When Weiss comes to speak of this book in his *Life of Parker* he ascends at once to that region of lofty phrases which is so natural with him. He asserts that people had their doubts in regard to the reality of the research and learning implied in the foot-notes: "It led them to suspect an illusion. Had all these leading books in all languages been faithfully read and assimilated? . . . Though they could not undertake to read Mr. Parker's authorities to trace the monstrous plagiarisms, the fact was assumed by every subservient mind," etc. In this Discourse, as printed in Miss Cobbe's edition of *Parker's Works*, I count four hundred and four different authors cited in the foot-notes. I have never seen the first edition, but it is clear, from what Parker says, that not many citations were added to the subsequent editions. Twenty-nine of these authors Parker is recorded by Weiss to have read before this book was published. It would surely have been possible for Mr. Parker to have read the Latin, French, and German books which he cites in his foot-notes after his settlement at Spring-street. Weiss quotes also one Italian work, Vico's *Scienza Nuova*. Three or four languages are no marvelous achievement; and merely to read books without digesting their contents is as possible as it is unprofitable. But if Mr. Weiss means that Parker had read and assimilated all these books, it would not be difficult to show the assertion false. It is only needful to examine the list of works cited to see the impossibility of the thing. Parker says in his *Experience as a Minister* that he used to work from ten to fifteen hours daily in literary tasks—twelve to seventeen is the statement which he made to a friend—but in a letter to Mr. Isaac Parker, written while he was still in West Roxbury, he tells him that he can obtain ten hours five days in the week for literary labors. The last statement is obviously the one most deserving of credit because it dates back to the period in question. At this rate the works cited would require Mr. Parker to read one volume every thirty working hours between his settlement and the publication of his book. This allows no time for letters, visits,

journeys, newspapers, reviews, for the thirteen elaborate articles which he wrote for the periodicals, for reading history, poetry, and other books into which he sometimes plunged, for Olympics, and verse writing and for private meditation in his reading and studies. The present writer has examined many of the works mentioned, has read many in all the languages to which they belong; they are mostly solid books, and they could not be read *and* digested in that time. Besides, the translation of De Wette was not finished July 13, 1837, and Parker tells us that the translation was the least of his labors in preparing that work for the press. On page 402, vol. i, of Weiss's Life, Parker tells George Ripley how he prepared this translation: "1. I read the original carefully, studied it (beginning in 1836) and the new editions as they successively appeared till 1843. 2. I translated word for word. 3. I read: (a) All the previous introductions of the Old Testament from Simon down to Hengstenberg. That was a labor. (b) All the Christian writers (Fathers, etc.) who treated of such matters down to Jerome and Augustine; that also took *some* time. (c) I read all modern works relating thereto; often a weariness. (d) I added from those what I thought necessary. . . . I popularized thus: (a) I translated all the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew (Rabbinical) passages which De Wette left untranslated, and I put the original extracts into the margin. It was a pretty piece of work, as you may guess, to do into English the awful Latin and Greek of the old choughs who wrote so barbarously. I looked over the references to the Bible." That this work was done during the time which preceded the appearance of the Discourse of Matters Pertaining to Religion, appears from a letter to Mr. Smith, under date of October 10, where he says that De Wette is in press, and that three hundred pages are stereotyped. He complains of having been ill all the summer, so that he could do almost nothing. Now it is remarkable that most of this work had no special relation to the Discourse. Here again we have the twenty-tongued boaster. Mr. Weiss is right in his supposition that Parker meant to have it understood that he had read the works he cites; such is the natural impression which the reader takes; and this impression is confirmed by the fact that Mr. Parker now and then tells us that such or such a book he has not seen

or read. This is the very youth who gets through all human history at the Divinity School, finds his investigations *hampered* by the *limits* of history, learns twelve languages thoroughly in two years, makes a mouthful of the course of study which was a three years' task for his class, and read meantime a list of books whose figure, as Réville says, really frightens us.

Mr. Parker's opponents "could not undertake to read his authorities!" Is skepticism, then, the indispensable qualification for scholarship? Shades of Stuart, Alexander, Norton, and Noyes, blush for your inferiority to this stripling! Before leaving this part of the subject we ought to note the influence of Parker in the direction of boastfulness. He had none of that literary modesty which prompted Lessing to write, "I would not seem to have read any book which I have not read." He never belonged to that University of which Liddon speaks, where it is a point of honor always to state things so that facts will more than justify the statement. To obtain credit for scholarship which we do not possess is literary dishonesty, and of this Parker was full. He seems to infect all who came in contact with him with the same spirit; for Mr. Weiss is by no means his sole victim. A curious illustration offers itself from the other side of the Atlantic. While writing these pages I have sought diversion rather than instruction in looking over a French book entitled Theodore Parker. It is from the pen of M. A. Réville, a distinguished Rationalist clergyman and biblical critic. I have found both instruction and amusement in its pages. Réville cites Weiss as his main authority for the account he gives of Parker. Weiss says that Parker's grandfather carried a light fowling-piece at the capture of Quebec; Réville says he "distinguished himself" there. Weiss says that he "was not engaged," though present, at the battle of Bunker Hill; Réville says he displayed a "veritable heroism" in that fight. Weiss says that when Theodore told his father that he had entered Harvard College he allayed the old gentleman's alarm at the probable expenses by telling him, "I mean to stay at home and keep up with my class;" Réville has it, "I intend to provide for my support by giving lessons or opening a school." Weiss confesses that Parker turned a little colored girl from his school in Watertown solely because certain patrons of the school demanded the act, and only defends him by

saying: "This he always confessed with mortification;" Réville expounds the line of defense thus: "But the very existence of his school, as yet hardly founded, and all his hopes, were at stake." Mr. Weiss says nothing about the personal attractions of Miss Cabot; but Réville, remembering that none but the brave deserve the fair, tell us that she "was a charming maiden, of remarkable beauty, and a teacher in the little town." Weiss calls the statement of belief in Parker's letter to Columbus Greene purely conventional; Réville glosses as follows: "In this confession of faith, evidently inspired by the fear of shocking a soul by clashing too roughly with its belief, Parker intends by the possibility of eternal punishment, that which would result from a voluntary and eternal persistence in sin." But Weiss should have taught him better. Weiss surely says quite enough about what Parker did in the Divinity School, but he furnishes no ground for Réville's assertion, that "after a few months there he had surpassed most of his professors themselves." Réville closes a long account of the persecutions Parker underwent for his ideas with the incomprehensible statement that "the Boston Academy did not dare to open its doors to him, where, without controversy, he would have occupied one of the chief places." Weiss gives no clue to this grief, and what it is I am at a loss to guess. Réville says that Parker's congregation numbered from seven thousand to eight thousand souls; Weiss, that it sometimes reached three thousand. Finally, Réville gives this original bit of information: Thanksgiving Day, "an annual service commemorative of the Declaration of Independence." I was always surprised at the exact and extensive knowledge of rationalistic critics. This is by no means the only discovery of that sort which has enlivened the dreary labor of this investigation.

But it is time to look at the contents of the Discourse of Religion. It is evidently an effort on the part of its author to clear what he conceives to be religion from entangling alliances. It is a vigorous rejection of the authority of the evangelical faith. The peculiar dogma of the book is the sufficiency of human nature for all its functions. Man's religion is a joint development from the nature within him and the outward world. God, duty, and immortality are conceptions which arise of themselves in human souls. Out of these fun-

damental ideas all religious systems have been builded up. These three great primary and intuitional truths of religion Parker claims, in the *Experience as a Minister*, to have reached before his settlement at West Roxbury. Yet it is remarkable that the intuition of moral law, and human duty under it, makes almost no figure in this Discourse. The intuition of God and the intuition of immortality are rather mentioned than discussed, since, being intuitions of the reason, they depend not on reasons, but on reason itself.

I have as little time as my readers would have patience for any minute criticism of this work. After discussing and clearing the idea of God, Parker dwells on the power of the religious idea—traces the development of religion through Fetichism, Polytheism, up to Monotheism. Next he glances at the doctrines of the primitive state of man and the immortality of the soul. Then follow discourses on Inspiration, Christianity, the Bible, and the Church. It will be seen from this schedule that here was an admirable opportunity to declare his notions on all the points in discussion between his foes and himself. There is little wonder that the book awakened a storm among the more moderate and conservative Unitarians. The orthodox seem to have enjoyed the confusion of their heretical friends when they found a heretic on their own hands upon whom they felt obliged to shut the door. There was not only some ground for alarm in the doctrines of the work themselves, but this was aggravated by the tone and spirit of the author. Even toward those whom he deemed his friends he indulged his sarcastic vein. Miss Bremer gives a characteristic glimpse of him at one of Alcott's conversations. The talk that evening had been conducted by several parties, and had been as vague and unsatisfactory as possible. Parker recited in a quiet, effective, but covertly sarcastic manner, the substance of what had been said. Alcott especially was touched with sly ridicule. This stroke of Parker's was so keen that the entire company smiled as he concluded. But Emerson turned with an eagle glance and said, "That is all true, all perfectly correct, and it would be all entirely proper were this a debating club instead of a free conversation. But I am reminded of an inscription over the door of the room where an English acquaintance assembles his friends for free and easy talk. I

cannot give the words, but the point of it is that every body has the right to say what seems to him good on any subject, but that none has the right to criticise what is said." On this repartee the company laughed again, this time at Parker's expense. He seemed a little hurt, blushed, and blamed the vagueness of the conversation. This anecdote puts Parker before us in his natural attitude of sarcasm, and of vexation when his sarcasm was resented. When his sermon on *The Transient and the Permanent in Christianity* appeared, the general verdict was that its temper was harsh and sarcastic. Parker had already been forced to defend himself from the same charge in relation to his article on Palfrey's Lectures in a letter to his classmate, Mr. Silsbee. His friends, like Miss Healy and his own brother-in-law, warned him of this peril. On occasion of his letter to the Unitarian Association, Miss Peabody suggested the same fault in gracious terms. When the discourse appeared, Dr. Francis, a somewhat partial judge, while excusing Parker from any evil motives, writes as follows: "I find a great deal in Parker's book to regret. . . . The spirit of it *seems* to be bad, derisive, sarcastic, arrogant, contemptuous of what the wise and good hold sacred. Nothing of all this did he mean, I am persuaded. I wish very much that he had reserved the publication of it till years had brought more consideration."

Mr. Parker had a ready answer for all such suggestions, and that answer was a flat denial. Never did he write a word against man or maid in a sarcastic humor; indeed he dared not; it was quite against his principles to do so. We can hardly accept this defense as honest without a suspicion of some defect in the quality of his mind. He somewhere admits having said sharp things, but declares he does not think them sarcastic. He defines sarcasm as flaying alive and stripping the flesh off the bones. We shall perhaps have occasion to cite some of his gentle sayings, and then our readers can judge for themselves on this head.

ART. II.—THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE PEOPLE.

Luther's Sämmtliche Schriften, herausg. von Dr. Walch. 24 Vols. Halle. 1740.
Pressensé's Early Years of Christianity. The Apostolic Era. New York. 1870.
Neander's History of the Christian Religion and Church during the First Three Centuries. New York. 1850.
M' Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia. Volume II. Art. Clergy.

ST. PETER'S words, "Ye are a royal priesthood," were, to the great Lutheran Reformers, infinitely more than a rhetorical phrase, or hyperbolic expression of the dignity of the common Christian life. Luther himself, in asserting that "the priesthood is common to all Christians," called this, and similar texts, "thunderbolts of God," against which, "neither all the Fathers, nor all the Councils, though they were innumerable; neither long continued usage, nor all the world combined, shall be able to prevail." They express one of the most effective ideas of the great Reformation, a characteristic idea of the primitive Church. They afford also, we think, the best solution of one of the greatest practical problems of modern Christianity. That problem is expressed to-day, throughout European and American Protestantism, by the question: How can the laity be brought into more effective co-operation with the ministry in the life and work of the Church? It has been discussed in sessions of the Evangelical Alliance; it was the chief thesis in a Convention, gathered from all parts of this country, not long since, in New York; and is an incessant topic in our religious journals. Nearly all evangelical denominations seem to be awaking to its urgency. In the New York Convention it assumed, perhaps, a somewhat "radical" form. Its supreme importance renders it desirable that it should be cautiously treated; but any just treatment of it, from the stand-point of the Reformers and of the Apostolic Church, will appear radical, if not heretical, to the confused vision of our times. We cannot fail, however, to perceive at a glance, that, if rightly developed, it may become an epochal idea of modern, as it was of ancient, Church history.

All earnest Christian minds vaguely recognize the true solution of the problem; but this vagueness, to a great degree, neutralizes its solution. General inculcations about the duty of "lay" devotion to Church interests will not suffice. Men of peculiar temperament, or special religious fervor, or ready utter-

ance in the social devotional assembly, or of other marked capacity for usefulness, may, here and there, be inspired by such vague appeals; but the Church, as a whole, will unconsciously evade them. We need more specific and positive teaching on the subject. The Apostolic and Lutheran doctrine of the "priesthood of the people" is the real dogmatic basis of the needed reform—the stand-point from which the responsibility of the laity should be asserted in our pulpits and religious journals. Thence alone can it take a readily cognizable and positive shape.

Our clergy need to study more the literature of the Reformation, to ascertain fully the importance of its teachings on this subject. The Reformation was projected on two great ideas—one theological, the other ecclesiastical. The former was Justification by Faith, the latter the Priesthood of the people. By the one it made the personal salvation of man dependent upon himself, striking away all supposed necessary dependence upon mystical, or rather magical, interventions of the clerical priesthood, and emancipating the individual conscience. By the other it struck, fatally, as we may still hope, the hierarchical ecclesiasticism by which Popery had bound down Europe for a thousand years.

Luther acknowledged the importance of the pastoral, or preaching, office; no man has more emphatically asserted its divine sanctions; but he insisted, in writing to the Senate of Prague, on the "institution of ministers," that the pastor is "*one who, in the place and in the name of all, who have the same right*," should perform the (sacred) offices, that there be not a base confusion among the people of God, and that a sort of a Babel be not made in the Church." In his "Articles of Schmalkald," written in expectation that they would be presented to a General Council, he affirms the same opinion. The Helvetic Confession, while asserting the importance of the ministry as a distinct function, declares that priesthood "is common to all Christians," though the ministerial function, of course, cannot expediently be so. "In the New Testament," it says, "there is no more such a priesthood as obtained among the ancient people of God, which has an outward anointing, and very many ceremonies, which were types of Christ, who, fulfilling them all, has abrogated all. He remains

the sole priest, and, lest we should derogate from him, we give the name of priest to no minister."

Popery saw the portentous significance of this great thesis of the Reformation; and the Council of Trent issued an article expressly against it, declaring that "if any one affirms that all Christians are, indiscriminately, priests of the New Testament, or that they are all mutually endowed with equal spiritual power, he clearly does nothing but confound the ecclesiastical hierarchy," etc.

Such was the position the Continental Reformers assumed on this question. But we derive our Protestantism mostly through the English Reformation, and this, controlled by an unscrupulous monarch, and led by prelatical chiefs, never thoroughly did its work. The remnants of papal error have, down to our times, disfigured Anglican Protestantism, and are to-day distracting and disabling the National Church; while its Episcopal offshoots in this country (including Methodism) show, more or less, traces of its perverting traditions. In the late struggle for "Lay Representation" in the higher councils of American Methodism, the advocates of the innovation had continually to combat these traditions. A brief speech by one of them, arguing for it from the teachings of the Reformation regarding the priesthood of the people, was generally assailed in the journals of the Church as gravely heretical; and even now, after four or five years, it continues to be assailed in some quarters, though it assumed not one position which is not known to every student of the literature of the Reformation as fundamental in that greatest of ecclesiastical revolutions; not one which the most authoritative Continental scholars of Europe, in ecclesiastical history, do not admit to have been fundamental in the polity of the primitive Church.*

But the Reformation can be no authority for us, except so far as it accorded with primitive Christianity. What, then,

*For Luther's views of the subject see Walch's edition of his works, volume x, and particularly Gessert's *Evangelisches Pfarramt*. After reviewing the Scripture testimony on the subject, Luther says, as we have already partly cited, "Let this suffice, for these passages establish, in the clearest and most powerful manner, that the office of the word of God is the highest in the Church, and that it is one and common to all who are Christians, not only by right, but by command. The priesthood must, therefore, be no other than a single office, which is common to all Christians. And against these thunderbolts of God, neither all the fathers,

does this say on the subject? The only Scripture use of the word "priest" or "priesthood," as it respects Christianity, is in reference to the common priesthood of Christian men, and the "high priesthood" of Christ. Search through the New Testament, and you will find that all such passages substantially agree with Peter's declaration: "Ye," the laity, the common Church, "are a chosen generation;" as much so as was the priestly tribe of Levi, and more, for ye are "a royal priesthood," and therein "a peculiar people." And again: "Ye are . . . built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices." St. John (Rev. i, 6) says: "Unto him who . . . both made us kings and priests unto God and his Father," etc., (v, 10; xx, 6.)

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is careful, respecting the high priesthood of Christ, to show that it is peculiar, is not according to the priesthood of Aaron or the Levites, but altogether unique—"after the order of Melchizedek." The old hierarchical system was now abolished, having answered its purpose as preliminary to Christianity. Christ having come, with him came the epoch of universal spiritual emancipation for the race. The rending of the temple's vail at his death had a sublime symbolical meaning. Hitherto the sacerdotal tribe could alone officiate in the temple—the highest priest could alone enter within the vail, the holiest of holies, and that but once a year; now had come the day of the universal ecclesiastical enfranchisement and the priestly consecration of all saints. The vail was "*rent from the top to the bottom*;" and now the apostle (Heb. x, 19) sublimely exhorts the Church, the "brethren," to "*have boldness to enter into the holiest*," the unvailled, innermost place of the abolished priesthood.

Christianity knows no technical or clerical priesthood—none other than this common priestly function and dignity of all regenerated souls, under the sacerdotal headship of Christ. It has its ministry—its divinely-sanctioned administrators of instruction and discipline—but not a proper priesthood. It clothes all its true children with pontifical robes, and commands all of

nor all the councils, though they were innumerable, neither long-continued usage, nor all the world combined, shall ever be able to prevail." He proceeds to show, in detail, that all other clerical functions, such as the sacraments, etc., originally pertained to the people.

them, as a "royal priesthood," to live, work, and suffer for the common Church, "the kingdom of God" on earth.

The priestly and prelatical ideas which characterized medieval Christianity, and still prevail so generally, sprung from early hierarchical tendencies in Church government. But what was the historical origin of the primitive Church government? what were the contemporary local facts bearing on the subject and illustrating its history? These should enable us to determine its significance.

The founders of Christianity were Jews; they saw the necessity of government in the incipient Church at Jerusalem, in a dispute about the distribution of alms, as narrated in the Acts of the Apostles; and they adopted in this exigency the usages to which they had been accustomed among their own countrymen; for these usages were simple, unpretentious, practically effective, and familiar to the people of the new communion. But let it be distinctly remarked that they did not go to the divinely-prescribed Levitical system for their Church order. They made no appeal to the writings of Moses, but to the Synagogue—to what may be called the provincial, the popular, religious usages of the Jews; the Synagogue order being not once mentioned in the writings of Moses, nor the Synagogue once alluded to by him, except so far as general admonitions to assemble for religious instruction can be construed as allusions to it. The Synagogue was founded in the local convenience of the people, as they found it to be expedient, after their settlement in Palestine. The Synagogues were chiefly provincial places of resort for the population on the Sabbath, when they could not go to the more or less distant metropolitan temple, the latter being peculiarly the seat of the national religion, the place of the official services of the priesthood. Some authorities suppose that they were first erected under the Maccabean princes, as there is nothing said of them in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. Their services were characterized by much popular freedom. Their officers were not priests, but laymen. Though they had appointed readers of the law, yet the right of speaking or preaching in them was voluntary, and free to all whose intelligence and character befitted it. Christ sometimes taught in them. The apostles proclaimed the Gospel in them in the chief cities of the Roman empire.

Aged men were appointed councilors in the Synagogue, one of their number being its president or "ruler." They were called elders, or presbyters; for these, now technicalized and mystified words, originally signified simply *old men*. There was also the "servant" of the synagogue, called a deacon, who had charge of the charities of the assembly and distributed them to the poor, and did other minor services. Hence the appointment of deacons in the Church at Jerusalem, for a similar purpose, as recorded in the book of Acts. These men were set apart for their functions by "ordination," or "imposition of hands"—a rite which *was not used in the consecration of the regular priesthood*, (anointing being the rite for that,) but which was a common mode of designating the rabbinical and municipal functionaries of the country.

Here, then, in common customs of their nation, the first Christians found a convenient system of order for the new Church in its emergency at Jerusalem, whence the system proceeded out through Christendom—a system which, we repeat, had no direct connection with the temple or divinely-appointed service of the Jews, which originated in popular good sense and local expediency, and which had not a single explicit prescription in their sacred writings. The apostles in copying it exemplified it, and their example is worthy of imitation, but they nowhere enjoin it.

But what a stupendous system of ecclesiasticism—of prerogatives, dignities, offices, and mysteries—has been constructed on this primitive, simple scheme of expediency! In the larger communities, where there were several presbyters, one of them was chosen to preside over the rest; he thus became the "overseer," (for this is the original meaning of *episcopos*, bishop;) but this simple distinction of office was perverted into diocesan prelacy, and at last culminated in the patriarchates of the East and the papacy of the West. The merely expedient distinctions of presbyter and deacon became mysterious and essential differences, indispensable priestly "orders," without which there can be no valid Church, no efficacious sacraments. The ceremony of "ordination," "imposition of hands," (at first only an impressive form of designation to office,) became a "sacrament," a sort of magical rite, communicating and transmitting from age to age a divine virtue, and

giving origin to the fable of "apostolic succession," with all its priestly arrogations, exclusiveness, and uncharitableness. The sublime idea of the priesthood of the people was eclipsed throughout Christendom for more than ten centuries, and the Church became, almost universally, a huge mass of commingled ritualism, hierarchism, magical rites, and popular legends.

The whole hierarchical system of Christendom thus arose out of one of the most simple incidents of primitive Christian history: the imitation, at Jerusalem, of the order of the Jewish Synagogue by the Judaic Christians, an order which, though adopted, was, let us remember, never enjoined in the apostolic writings. Methodists, at least, believe with John Wesley that Scripture "prescribes no particular form of Church government;" that the only New Testament ordinance on the subject is, "Let all things be done decently and in order." And the view we take of the subject is thoroughly compatible with congregational decorum and public order. Luther, after showing that every right of the ministry is a common right of the laity, adds:

Nevertheless, we have said this alone of the common rights and power of all Christians. For as all things are to be common to all Christians, as we have thus far explained and proved, it would be unbecoming for any one to push himself forward, appropriate to himself alone what belongs to us all, venture upon the use of this right, and, in case there be no one present who has also received such a right, exercise it in practice. But the right of the congregation demands this: that one, or as many as the congregation pleases, be elected and accepted, who shall, in the name of all the others, who have the same right, and in their stead, fill these offices publicly, so that there may not occur abominable disorders among the people of God, and the Church of Christ become a Babylon; but that all things shall take place in an orderly manner, as the apostle has taught. (1 Cor. xiv, 40.) This right is twofold: the one a common right exercised through the call of the congregation; the other that an individual in case of necessity use the same right. In a congregation where this right is free to all no one shall arrogate its exercise to himself without the will and call of the whole congregation. But, in cases of necessity, any one, yea, whosoever will, may avail himself of the same right.

No authority has uttered higher opinions of the divine sanction or the divine "call" of the ministry than Luther; but he found no difficulty in reconciling these with the priestly right

inherent in the congregation. Expediency was, with him, divine law, there being nothing expedient that is not right.*

Having thus reviewed the subject from the identical standpoint of the Reformation and the primitive Church, let us now consider some of the deductions which may be made from it:

First. We infer from it the essential equality of all saints, in the kingdom of God on earth. They are all a "royal priesthood"—all summoned to enter through the rent veil into the "holiest of holies," whither the supreme pontiff of the old dispensation could alone go. To eyes undimmed by the perverse traditions of the post-apostolic ages, the thoroughly democratic constitution of the primitive Church stands out a fact manifest and sublime. On the apostles, as the companions and personal witnesses of Christ, devolved the task of founding it by the general promulgation of his truth. They never pause to construct for it a formal polity; they adopt instead expedient measures, as these may be casually needed, and, having completed their mission, the apostolate expires, leaving the new-born communion free to grow by its own normal development according to the varied conditions of different lands and

* Students of Church polity, who may wish further critical verifications of the above views than are given in the authorities at the head of our article, may be referred to Vitringa's *De Synagoga Veteri*; Stillingfleet's *Irenicum*; Lord King's *Primitive Church*; Archbishop Whateley's *Kingdom of Christ*. Pressensé's recent volume on *The Apostolic Era* takes extreme but well-authenticated views of the priesthood and general powers of the people in the primitive Church. Published in this country by the Methodist Episcopal Church, it may be supposed to be thus tacitly indorsed by the denomination. The highest Methodist authorities on such questions (McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopedia*, under the word "Clergy") giving substantially Neander's opinion, say: "In the Apostolical Church no abstract distinction of clergy and laity, as to privilege or sanctity, was known; all believers were called to the prophetic, kingly, and priestly offices in Christ. (1 Pet. v. 3.) The Jewish antithesis of clergy and laity was at first unknown among Christians, and it was only as men fell back from the evangelical to the Jewish point of view that the idea of the general Christian priesthood of all believers gave place, more or less completely, to that of the special priesthood or clergy. So Tertullian says, (*De Baptismo*, p. 17, before he became a Montanist:) 'The laity have also the right to administer the sacraments and to teach in the community. . . . If we look at the order necessary to be maintained in the Church, the laity are therefore to exercise their priestly right of administering the sacraments only when the time or circumstances require it.' From the time of Cyprian, (A. D. 258,) the father of the hierarchical system, the distinction of clergy and laity became prominent, and very soon was universally admitted. Indeed, from the third century onward the term *clerus* was almost exclusively applied to the ministry to distinguish it from the laity."

ages, guided by the divine truth and spirit with which it was endowed. We have seen how it borrowed its first simple regulations from the contemporary usages of the Jews. None of these marred its democratic simplicity. As a whole, a sanctified community, it was charged with its entire remaining mission. Its gifts were common. "The advocates of the hierarchy," says one of our best authorities, (Pressensé,) "do not deny that the miraculous gifts were bestowed on the Christians generally; but they assert, on behalf of the ecclesiastics, a monopoly of teaching. This distinction, however, is wholly arbitrary. The synagogue already acknowledged, under certain limitations, the right of every pious Jew to teach. It is not surprising that this right should be extended by St. Paul to all Christians, with the exception of women, who were to be silent in public worship. 'When ye come together,' he says, 'every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying.' The right was long acknowledged in the Church. We read in the eighth book of the Apostolical Constitutions, 'Let him who teacheth, if he be a layman, be versed in the word.' It remains an established fact that all believers had the right to teach in public worship. All alike took some share in the government of the community. They were summoned, on the occasion of the conferences at Jerusalem, to take a part in important deliberations. The letters of the apostles laid upon all the duty of caring for the great interests of the congregation. Discipline was an act of the community, not of the clergy. The sacraments were equally far from being a monopoly of the clergy. These principles were so deeply rooted in the Church that long after, at a time when it had undergone most important changes, they received striking testimony from the lips of St. Jerome. He says: 'The right of the laity to baptize has often been recognized in cases of necessity; for every one may give that which he has received.' We read in the 'Commentaries,' attributed to Ambrose, that 'in the beginning all taught and all baptized on every opportunity.'"

Such was the simple, practical freedom of original Christianity. Of course, the partial delegation of these rights and powers of the Church to selected men became necessary, at last, for its orderly procedure; but the inherent right of the

common priesthood remained. It could not be surrendered, for it was of divine ordination; so that, in the language of Luther, the designated preacher is but "one who in the place and in the name of all, who have the same right, should perform the sacred offices, that there be not confusion." Restricted only by the necessities of public order, the layman still maintained his priestly responsibility, and shared in every possible way the work and discipline of the society. Throughout the apostolic period this right was practical in the Church, and made it universally a body of working men and women, self-sacrificing in labor and heroic in suffering, until it overthrew the paganism of the classic world.

This doctrine does not detract from the "divine call" and dignity of the "ministry" proper. Yet it is precisely at this point that we need to clear up the whole subject to the people, by better discussion than it has usually received. We all admit the divine "call" of the pastorate, but in conceding it we have come, practically, to infer that no analogous vocation or responsibility belongs to the laity. The ministerial "call" is a conviction of the conscience, by the Holy Spirit, of the duty of preaching. But does not every real Christian have the Holy Spirit? Is not religion itself the indwelling of the Spirit—"the life of God in the soul of man?" And does not the indwelling Spirit "move" and aid every devout soul in matters of religious devotion and duty? Can, then, a rightly instructed layman, any more than a clergyman, evade, while under the influence of the Holy Spirit, any important occasion of duty without feeling the "woe" which Paul dreaded if he preached not the Gospel? And is not every opportunity of usefulness a *duty* to such a man? Let us not be misinterpreted here, for this point is vital. The work of the pastorate is the highest in the Church, and its call or responsibility is correspondent; but every saint—that is to say, every lay or "royal priest"—in the Church has the same Spirit, the same divine "moving," and help to duty, in his sphere and degree, and a proportionate "woe" if he neglect that duty. Each, as a member of the common priesthood, is to find out, by the light of the Spirit and the scrupulous consideration of his peculiar gifts or circumstances, in what particular way he is to discharge his part of the common service, the ministration

and propagation of the common cause: some to preach; some to "exhort;" some to teach; some to lead in the social devotions of the society; some to provide pecuniary supplies by their talents in business; but all to serve with equal consecration, moved, aided, and consoled by the same divine Spirit, in the one universal priesthood. The great error of Christendom is that the Church continues to allow an unscriptural discrimination here; that the vocation, or "moving," of the divine Spirit has been claimed by the clergy as a peculiar distinction of their function. This arrogation has been one of the most disastrous calamities in the history of the Church, for it has given rise to nearly all the usurpations and corruptions of the priestly class on the one side, and to the ecclesiastical enslavement and moral disablement of the laity on the other. It has practically identified the Church with the clergy.*

It is to be feared that in our own denomination this clerical arrogation (not to say arrogance) has grown rather than diminished. In certain quarters there has been no little disposition even to except ordained teachers from the ministry, and to consider clerical educators wrongly recognized in our Conferences. One of our journals says that "Prof. Wheeler was right when he surrendered his credentials, after having fully determined to devote himself to teaching." It speaks of clerical teachers, and other extra-pastoral functionaries, as practically belying the ministerial office, because they have nothing really to do with pastoral work. It seems to forget that even the apostles did little pastoral service, proper; that the original ministry is scripturally described as consisting of "some apostles, some prophets, and some evangelists, and *some pastors and teachers*, for the perfecting of the saints, for the *work* of the *ministry*." Now, though we need not insist that precisely this classification of ministerial laborers must be retained, intact, yet we do insist that it clearly shows the comprehensive and liberal scope of the ministerial organization. The apostolate necessarily died out with the apostles, and the form and

* "Arnold at a later day called him [Coleridge] the greatest intellect that England had produced within his memory, and learned, perhaps, from him some of his leading thoughts, as that the identification of the Church with the clergy was the 'first and fundamental apostasy.'"—Shairp's, 'Studies in Poetry and Philosophy,' p. 142. See Arnold's views, fully given in his *Miscellaneous Works*.

titles of some of the other offices gave way to modifications and new designations as the Church developed. Though no form of polity or Church organization is enjoined in the Holy Scriptures, yet two were exemplified: first, that above indicated by Paul; and, secondly, the later (yet partially contemporary) modifications, borrowed from the synagogue, and consisting of deacons, presbyters, and superintending presbyters or bishops. These latter, as we have seen, were a mere matter of practical convenience. Crystallizing at last into a permanent ministerial economy, they, like some natural crystalline forms, enlarged in the process till the hierarchical systems of the Greek and Latin ecclesiasticism covered Christendom. But the original comprehensiveness and flexibility of the genuine ministry remain scriptural facts, and a decisive criterion for all such questions.

The lapse of time—of ages—has thrown not a few illusions over the primitive ecclesiasticism. With modern Churchmen, the forms and nomenclature of the early ministry, borrowed, as merely expedient, from the Jews, have become absolutely essential conditions of Church validity. "Ordination" has become even a sacrament with the Greek and Latin Churches, and something hardly less with High-Church Protestants. So the classification of deacons, presbyters, and superintendents or bishops, (jointed in with the more promiscuous functional arrangements of the earlier period, when there were "teachers" as well as "pastors,") has become a divine order, necessary to the very constitution of the Church, in the estimation of many. To others, there seems to be no genuine idea of the ministry unless it includes the "pastoral" service, whereas all critical students of Church history know that the "pastors" were really secondary in the early Church; that most of her ministers were apostles and evangelists, flying about the world promulgating the new truth; and that the "pastors" and "teachers" were chiefly located presbyters and deacons, the latter being "servants" of the Church, many of them what would now be called laymen.

Even the word "preaching," we may remark in passing, has suffered by these illusions of time, as we have called them. Many Churchmen (Methodists as well as others) seem to think that there is no real preaching except in a pulpit, and on a text,

and with technical discriminations of the text, whereas the original preaching was substantially what is now good Methodist "exhortation." Its preachers had no pulpits for generations, except the platforms of the Jewish synagogues, scattered over the Roman empire; and these they hardly got on to before they were driven off again by their obstinate countrymen. And as to formal preaching, in the modern sense, they knew little or nothing about it. The "firstly," "secondly," and "thirdly" of the "sermon" were unknown to them, and did not appear in clerical literature till about the times of Origen. In fine, the original ministry was, comprehensively, an organization for the *propagandism* or outspread of the new truth all over the world. All kinds of laborers, competent for this work, were incorporated in it. They were put under wholesome regulations as fast as possible; were baptized for their work by the Holy Ghost; and the Church rejoiced and triumphed in its ever-growing host of prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, and "servants," or deacons and deaconesses. Clemens (of Alexandria) and Origen are known to us more as teachers of Christian schools than any thing else. St. John himself became a Christian school-teacher, as well as an apostle and prophet. And a glory will it be to Methodism when its Conferences shall be thronged with "teachers," and "evangelists," and "apostles," as well as "pastors." Any man called to "preach," but at the same time eminently capable of teaching in our academies or colleges, should work in the latter, and preach also whenever and wherever he can. He should have his place, and an honored one, among his ministerial brethren in the councils of the Church. Let us not disparage the noble ministerial service and character of our Fisks and Olins. When shall we perfect the "glorious Reformation" by the complete restoration of primitive Christianity in its simplicity and power? When shall we rend off the shackles of medieval ecclesiasticism, and stand forth in the freedom and victory of the apostolic *propagandism*? When shall Christianity cease entirely to be the grub of papal darkness, and, bursting its old ecclesiastical chrysalis, take wing and fly over the world, like the apocalyptic angel "flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people?"

The Reformers themselves, tenacious as they were of some figments of popery, were, as we have seen, in advance of our times respecting the doctrine of priesthood, and the true character of the Christian ministry. Methodism practically, and almost unconsciously, got nearly back to the apostolic programme; but we, ever and anon, stultify our own history, and propound notions which would nullify half our powers. What, for instance, are we doing with our old and divine "orders" of "exhorters" and "local preachers"—as divine, by the anointing of the Holy Ghost and historical usefulness, as any "order" among us? Well would it be for us to turn back to our glorious history and more glorious Gospel and abide by them.

Not only theoretically but historically the Methodist local ministry presents one of the very best exemplifications of the "priesthood of the people," of lay ministration. It would seem to be the very "desideratum" that other evangelical denominations are seeking, are "feeling after," under the prevailing conviction of the need of better co-operation of the laity with the clergy in the life and work of the Church. It needs, and must have, better recognition among us if we are not to lose disastrously our original power. For years it has been numerically almost twice as strong as the itinerant or "regular" ministry. It comprises a mighty, though mostly latent, force. It might be made a tremendous engine of evangelical power. It once was such, not only in England but in this country. It founded Methodism not only in Nova Scotia, Upper Canada, and New York, but all west of the Alleghanies, and in the West Indies, Australia, and Africa. With such an historical prestige, it is amazing that the Church has allowed it to practically lapse into comparative inefficiency, especially at this moment, when all other evangelical Churches are so eagerly inquiring how they can bring out their lay talents for the evangelical work of the age.

The usual reasoning on this change in our policy is, we think, quite illogical. The improvement of our regular ministry and of our congregations is certainly no relevant reason for it, for with this improvement has come a correspondent improvement of the *materiel* out of which to make effective local preachers. The Church is full of advanced laymen—teachers, legislators, lawyers, doctors, and others equally able—

whom she should set to work in her service, as she did in her old victorious days. But the very thought of the availability of these forces seems to have almost died out of the denomination in our older fields. Who can deny that there is as wide and urgent a field as ever there has been in our history, for such laborers, in the vast neglected suburbs of our great cities, and in our rural districts as well? Could these auxiliaries be worked systematically, they might indeed be redoubled in number without becoming superfluously abundant. Their standard of ability would be as well suited to the standard of intelligence in such fields as ever it was in our earlier history. The whole country needs just such religious workmen; its moral exigencies cry out for them, and the Church could hardly do a better work than to rally them, and in spirit and reorganize them for a new universal campaign.

Their better recognition would be an inestimable advantage to the regular ministry. Many of the latter are overworked, and yet see all around their stations neglected fields going to waste. Could they command licensed lay assistants for these waste places, and, directing their labors, garner their fruits in their Churches, many a feeble station would soon be powerfully reinforced, many a whole region now morally stagnant be awakened to religious inquiry and activity.

There has not been since the apostolic age, we repeat, a more striking example of the "priesthood of the people" than this "local ministry" of Methodism. Methodist history is full, as we have seen, of its achievements. It has pre-eminently been the recruiting service for our "regular" ministry. It is now estimated that the annual demand of our Conferences for recruits amounts to eight hundred. "Very soon," says one of our organs, "a thousand a year will be required to keep the itinerant ranks filled and to occupy new fields of labor." One thing is clear enough, namely, that we cannot expect this great but necessary reinforcement from our theological schools. We must keep up, or rather restore, our old recruiting method by graduating our young men through the orders of licensed "exhorters" and "local preachers" into the traveling ministry. This was our primitive process, and it filled the ranks of the itinerancy with the mightiest men that ever stood in the American pulpit. We need the theological school. We rec-

commend every young candidate to go to it if he can. But we soberly believe that the day will be disastrous to Methodism when we come to rely exclusively upon our training schools for our ministerial supplies. Let us beware of any such Procrustean policy. It is alike incompatible with the genius and the prospective needs of our cause.

On the ground of the essential parity of the common membership of the Church, these and all other evangelical laborers belong to its common priesthood—to its one great scheme of universal evangelization. They differ in functional degrees and in consequent official dignity, (a comparatively small consideration, however,) but they are all baptized with, and “moved” by, the Holy Ghost to their work—a common work in general, however expediently discriminated in particular. Methodism has made a great historical “testimony” (as the Quakers would call it) on this subject of lay priesthood. Wesley always insisted that his local preachers were essentially laymen; yet the “call” of the Holy Spirit was with him their primary claim to authorization as preachers. He went further; he even held that his “regular” or “itinerant” preachers were not “clergymen,” in the sense of the Anglican Church. In his latest sermon addressed to them he exhorts them to disclaim any such pretension. He esteemed them a lay ministry;* yet the conscious “call” of the Spirit was a condition of admission to his Conference. Both local and regular preachers in the American Methodist Church are required to have this “call” before admission to ordination.

There is no “radicalism” (in the bad sense of the term) in the foregoing ideas; they are the old truth, and the truth that must yet come forth all over Christendom if the world is to be saved. They are compatible, perfectly, with the highest system of order and responsibility, especially with our own Church order. What Methodism should always aim at, next to purity, is the freest possible activity, regulated by systematic order and responsibility. It has had a great theological mission in the world; its history may yet show that it has a greater ecclesiastical one. Contrary to the traditions of the National Church,

* In his original epitaph, in City Road Chapel, he was honored as Founder of the Methodist “Lay Ministry;” but the phrase was afterward changed to “Itinerant Ministry.”

contrary to the prejudices of his own education, Wesley did, we insist, practically recognize the Lutheran and apostolic doctrine of the priesthood of the people. Methodism was founded by that fact, and could not otherwise have been founded. Methodists, throughout the world, should hold fast to the momentous fact, as one of the most notable lessons of their history.

Secondly. We infer from the subject the universal obligation of Christian labor, and the identity of the principle of its responsibility among all classes of Christian men.

As above stated and guarded, the doctrine of the priesthood of the people appears, we think, clear enough; but where in Christendom is it vividly and *practically* recognized? And yet, who does not perceive that it is the best, the only legitimate, solution of the problem of lay responsibility in Church life and labor; that, if luminously brought out in the pulpits of Protestantism, it would evoke the energies of the Church, as in a general resurrection from the dead; that our present vague, if not merely casual, lay activity, with hardly any distinct recognition of conscience in it, but rather a self-flattering substitution of "benevolence" for conscience, would soon take on the power and majesty of duty, of conscience, of a divine and indefeasible priestly commission?

Our men of "business" should learn that they have no more right to use their talents and success for merely selfish advantage than the pastors within their altars, the city missionaries who may be starving on their stunted contributions, or the evangelists whom they send to the ends of the earth, have to be equally selfish. Learning this, they would change the whole condition of the religious world, and in doing so they would, as we have shown, but restore primitive Christianity, reviving the original idea of the Church that all men who by regeneration have entered the kingdom of God have *come out* from the world, and must live, work, and, if need be, die, for the interests of that kingdom; that whatever difference of function, or mode of work, there may be, as between pastor and layman, and whatever difference in the degree of their responsibility, there is no difference in the principle of that responsibility; that it is universal; that the *one* talent will be held accountable as well as the two or five; that it was in the Divine Master's great lesson not the man of superiority,

nor he of mediocrity, but he of inferiority—he of the one talent, rather than of the two or five—who was lost and cast into “outer darkness.” A universal consciousness of common responsibility—of common priestly consecration to the one great mission of the Church, the salvation of the world—working always and every-where; self-denial and self-sacrifice, even unto death, for the common cause: this was the spirit of the original Church. This, inspired by the Spirit from on high, enabled its fishermen, peasants, and publicans to come forth from the obscure Galilean villages and the humble “upper chambers” of Jerusalem to establish a world-wide realm while the Jewish State was sinking around them in its last decay; its quarrymen and slaves to come forth from the Roman Catacombs to confront the throne of the Cæsars and humble around its altars the senate, the schools, the armies, and the multitudinous populations of the empire of the world. The same working, self-denying spirit must pervade the Church again if ever it is to accomplish its appointed mission throughout the earth. Its secular men must understand that they are sacerdotal as well as secular—that though in the world, they are not of it. They are “not their own,” but are “bought with a price,” and should therefore “glorify God in their bodies and in their spirits, which are God’s.” Driving the plow, wielding the ax, or mingling in the throngs of the mart, they should remember that they bear a divine commission, and, while “providing for those of their own house,” should consecrate their gains and their whole life as a ministration of the common priesthood. In no age and in no land has this duty been more urgent than it is among us in this New World, and here, if anywhere, should be revived in power the primitive policy of Christianity. Our country has now an area of more than four and a half millions of territory—nearly a million more than all Europe. What a geographical field has the American Church, then, here in its own immediate homework! The Christianization of all Europe was not so grand a mission to the primitive Church. We are building up a moral empire which, by its better auspices and its wider relations to all the world, promises to be more important in the future of history than Europe has been in the past.

Our population is now estimated at about thirty-nine mill-

ions. Numerically, then, we may appear small by the side of Europe with her more than two hundred and ninety millions; but even this difference is but temporary. We are gaining on her at a rate which, were it not ascertained by authentic statistics, would seem incredible. We double our numbers in about a generation. By the end of the century they will have grown to about eighty millions. In about eighty years they will be equal to all the present population of Europe. According to the tables of longevity, there are some thousands of our children who will see that time. And what an epoch will that be, if the Republic but maintain its unity! That it will do so we have every reason to believe. Every motive of interest and ambition will dispose it to hold fast to its nationality, which is thus becoming every decade surpassingly grand. We have had enough of disunion and war to teach us the value of union and peace for a century at least.*

It is well for us thus to measure our future; not in the spirit of national vanity, but that we may appreciate the work before us and its immense responsibility. Our political and social mission may be sublime beyond that of any other contemporary people. A nation with one system of laws, free, intelligent, rife with industrial enterprise, and equivalent in territory and population to Europe, will be a fact without a parallel in the history of mankind. What a consummation, it has been said, would it be were all Europe itself to be thus one united, free, enlightened nationality, with one language and under one flag, from Spitzbergen to Malta, from Lisbon to Moscow! When that day comes for us, the mere moral power of our example can hardly fail to be omnipotent among the nations. But to reach this grand consummation we must, as never a people has before, work out our national advancement. We must educate the people; we must evangelize them; we must cover the continent with schools and churches, for the school-house and the church are the only sure fortifications of such a nation. We have done much in these respects, but, looking at our prospective wants, we have hardly more than begun the sublime task. Population is surging in upon us from Europe on the one hand and Asia on the other.

* For fuller statistical details on this subject see "The Centenary of American Methodism." New York. 1866.

The mighty waves roll over our prairies and mountains. Education and religion must keep up with them, or they will break down the strongholds of our public safety, and submerge the national morals and order. We must, more than ever, consecrate our ever-increasing wealth to the public good. Never has there been an equal field for public spirit and Christian zeal; never a more urgent summons to liberality, and heroic devotion to philanthropic work. To the American Christian, more than to any other on earth, has the divine precept that "no man liveth unto himself," become an irresistible truth. Let us confront boldly our unparalleled work. Its greatness should make us all great. The mission of this new world is not merely to make a great nationality, great materialistic improvements, great fortunes, but a great humanity. Great work is the best means of making great souls. Christian life may yet take a development here such as it has had nowhere else since the apostolic age, and such as may effect the triumph of Christianity throughout the world. This we may yet find to be the providential significance of our peculiar history and destiny.

We need this consecration of secular life the more urgently in this country to save our Christian men from our greatest national passion, the love of money—that passion which holy Scripture denounces as "the root of all evil," which is periling the very morals of trade among us, and which so often becomes what medical science must pronounce a species of mental disease, of actual mania. Brion, the philosopher, said to a miser, "You do not possess your wealth, but your wealth possesses you." There are some very curious revelations of human nature brought out by wealth, real "phenomena," well worth the study of thoughtful minds. As a representative of values, and as, therefore, the means of the acquisition of all things, except wisdom and virtue—and of even these to some extent—money is obviously a desirable possession, and what is called "competence" should be the aim of all men. But it is astonishing how an aim thus intrinsically wise, and among the wisest in human life, should be doomed almost always to overshoot its mark, as if there were some irony of fate mocking the calculations of shrewdness. Few men ever attain a just competence without apparently losing their capacity to appreciate

it. Some sinister power seems to play fantastic tricks with their calculations, and they think they see more need than ever of additional resources; their competence must be made secure by excessive surplusages; these again multiply the contingencies of fortune, and must themselves be fortified by additional securities, and thus the passion for gain goes on until the strangest transmutation takes place in the very reason of the man. His selfishness virtually defeats itself by losing the real advantages of wealth for wealth itself. The sinister power which has been playing its tricks with him becomes a stern and terrible Nemesis, puts out his eyes, and leads him blindly on, overburdened with treasure, while denying him the very enjoyments for which alone it is desirable. His shrewdness in making money remains; it will most probably increase, but it becomes an anomaly among the mental capacities; it is shrewdness against wisdom; it is logic without reasoning. Money, which is only a means, becomes an end, an overtopping, all-consuming end. It burdens life with cares and anxieties instead of relieving them; and the really poor victim of the irrational passion at last dies amid unused accumulations, which have only clogged his existence, especially in those most important later years of his life, when he has needed most repose and clearness of mind for both the infirmities of this life and the preparations of the life to come. What a terrible power of perversion has the love of wealth, when it thus becomes an habitual passion! What a really retributive power! Milton, speaking of the "fallen angels" before they fell, describes Mammon as somewhat mean, even in heaven, with brow prone downward in contemplating the "golden street." A clerical writer of long pastoral experience records that he has seen men reclaimed from every other vice, from the lowest debasement of every other passion, but never one fully saved from avarice. Many misers have been gathered into the communion of the Church, but how seldom has one ever been known to recover from the power of this demon more than temporarily? It would seem to be a sort of reprobation. Doubtless to an earnest penitent the grace of God is omnipotent; but, alas! how hard it seems for a devotee of Mammon to become an earnest penitent—to rend off and hurl away his golden fetters!

Money-making men have, then, a grave liability to watch against. Their besetting passion is, perhaps, the most insidious of vices; it coils like a gliding snake around them, till they are wrapped inextricably in its folds. But, on the other hand, wealth is one of the grandest advantages if rightly applied. The talent to make it is God-given, and they who have that talent should use it to the utmost as a most precious endowment for the good of the world. It promotes business; it gives industrial employment to the poor; it prompts invention; it advances civilization. Wealth is capital; and there can be no great industrial enterprise, no advanced civilization, without capital. Money can have the highest consecration; it can establish great and perpetual institutions of education, of charitable and scientific relief to human suffering, of religious propagandism. It is astonishing that successful business men do not more generally perceive these its noblest uses. The grateful recognition of communities, and of posterity, is a worthy, a virtuous object of ambition; but what commemorative monuments can equal those which rich men can erect to themselves in hospitals, colleges, church edifices, public libraries? In these, it has been justly observed, they may live on, ages after death, a more effective life than they ever had in the flesh, and with ever augmenting rewards in eternity. Many a man of wealth would give his fortune for the fame of a Da Vinci, a Raphael, or a Michael Angelo; but money cannot buy genius; it may, however, buy something better—higher usefulness, and equally enduring and more grateful remembrance in the heart of the world. How can a Christian capitalist forego such possibilities?

We are the more urgent in pressing the doctrine of the priesthood of the people on the attention of successful Christian "men of business," because in this country they have special advantages. In no other nation has wealth afforded such ample means for usefulness. The official census shows that, in 1850, the amount of our property, real and personal, was \$7,000,000,000; by 1860 it advanced to more than \$16,000,000,000; by 1870 to \$30,000,000,000. There is no other recorded example of such a growth of wealth. It is a possibility only of the new world. In ten years our aggregate property much more than doubled; in twenty years it much

more than quadrupled. All this advance, let us remember, has been made in the present generation; in about two thirds the time of a generation. Evidently, wealth and luxury will overwhelm us unless corrected by a better standard of Christian life and liberality. All these means, among Christian men, belong legitimately to the Church, for these men are its "royal priesthood."

We believe that a just, a really sober view of this subject, such as is implied in the "priesthood of the people," would make an epoch in Christian civilization, and we are not without hope that wealth is yet destined to such a consecration. Examples occur in England and in this country increasingly. They may yet become a rule, rather than an exception, among Christian capitalists. Not until then will sound reason and sound religion have their normal sway in the business life of Christendom.

But let it not be thought that because we thus speak of "men of business," "men of fortune," the Christian obligation we have been discussing chiefly devolves upon them. As the priestly function is common, it applies to the humblest spheres of life. There is not one of us who is not here on earth in the order of Divine Providence, and with a providential work before us. We can minister in our "holy priesthood" at our family altars, in our workshops, in our neighborly relations. Our hard-earned pittance may be the most acceptable offerings presented in the temple. Christ has consecrated forever, in the memory of his Church, the poor widow's mite, and her example, says a great divine, has done more for the charities of Christendom than the conversion of Constantine. Say not, ye poor and humble ones, that you can do nothing. There is not a day, scarcely an hour, in which ye cannot scatter about you the good seed. It was precisely in those lowly spheres of life in which you move that early Christianity began its work and laid its imperishable foundations. By converse, neighbor with neighbor, by household meetings in "upper chambers," by charities in the name of their Lord, by pure living and meek and brave suffering, as well as by apostolic preaching, they swept away at last the imperial heathenism of the Roman world.

And Christian women may well remember the devout women

who ministered to Christ, and who are incessantly alluded to in the Acts and the Epistles as helpers of the apostles—the deaconesses and prophetesses of the New Dispensation. The New Dispensation recognizes them in the common priesthood. They should be the vestal priestesses at its altars. Do they complain of the limitations on their Christian usefulness, the never-ending drudgery and toil of their homes? Let them remember that every Christian household should be a church; every nursery a sanctuary; every cradle a shrine at which the maternal priestess may kneel with prayers for the young immortal who, if trained for heaven, shall, in the language of Christ, be equal unto the angels. What if an infant cherub, winged and radiant, should accidentally drop from heaven into a Christian matron's home; would she not deem its care a divine and blessed responsibility? How would she love and nurture it, till some kindred messenger from the skies should come to reclaim it! How would its presence honor her house! All the streets leading thither would be thronged with wondering and reverent multitudes, eager to behold the celestial sight. All the world would report and discuss the marvelous fact. But such homes have already as high and holy an honor; many of them have whole groups of young angels, as immortal as any in higher worlds. They "have entertained angels unawares." No priesthood on earth is higher or more capable than that of Christian maternity. Its ministry extends at last into the "holiest of holies" of the very heavens.

Has God endowed a Christian woman with special gifts for usefulness in the Church? The gifts themselves are the warrant of her right to use them. "Let all things be done decently and in order," is indeed a divine maxim, and woman's heart will instinctively recognize it; but an extreme construction of St. Paul's views of female decorum in the congregation is, we think, a general fault of our modern Church-life. A large portion of our Church-life consists of social religious services. What would any other form of social life, any other social gatherings, be if the women present were required to be mute spectators? Would not such a conventionalism absolutely spoil our social life generally? Paul did not allow women to speak in the "ecclesia," but why apply this to the familiar social assemblies of Christians, even if it were applicable to

more public occasions? Paul, as we have seen, recognizes the saintly services of women, of "deaconesses" and "prophetesses." And even if he advised their non-interference in the "ecclesia," yet he did not institute the interdiction as *perpetual*. It was evidently a matter of conventional decorum, a concession to the peculiar oriental or pagan manners of the age, in countries in which women were extremely restricted. It was prudence in the Church not to outrage in such things the long-established customs of the East. Primitive Christianity was eminently prudent, though in all essential matters heroic. Certainly the Oriental conventionalism regarding women, requiring them, in some sections, to be always veiled when abroad, (as to-day in the Levant generally,) to sit apart and behind screens in religious congregations even among the Jews, were not matters of divine morality, but merely of local custom. Christianity in such cases, as in the more important one of slavery, did not declare direct war, but chose rather to put in operation general principles of moral training, which should, sooner or later, uproot the evil. Assuredly Paul's concession to his times, on female decorum in the Christian assembly, has been essentially modified by our different civilization. Methodism, then, we think, is right in the freedom it accords the sex in its Church-life. It has found, with Quakerism, that a degree of feminine activity in religious life, which would have been entirely inadmissible in the ancient East, is perfectly compatible with the decorum of social, and even public, worship, and can give a gentle and hallowed dignity to the offices of the sanctuary. Good order, directed by good sense, must control this matter in the Churches; but nothing can ever invalidate the claim of woman, as a member of the Christian communion, to the right of the common "priesthood of the people."

Thirdly. May we not infer from this review of the subject that there is still much of popery to be purged away from our Protestantism? Do not its "fag ends" cling to nearly the whole apparel of the Church? The two principal characteristics of popery are its hierarchical distinctions and its abject subjection to authority. Thence have come its chief corruptions and its imperious uncharitableness, and thence also its present calamities and decadence. We have seen how simple

and democratic was original Christianity. We look in vain in the New Testament for the official distinctions and powers of the medieval Church; but do we not find traces of them to-day in nearly all our Church polities? If they stifled the religious life of the laity in that Church, do they not shackle it, at least, in most of our Protestant communions? And can our faith ever have its free and full activity in the world till we break off and throw from us these fetters? Does not also "authority" still dominate over us, giving undue importance to secondary matters, restricting the free action of the Christian conscience, or forcing it to break away into eccentric and perilous liberties, into sectarian divisions, and then again binding it with fetters of opinionativeness and bigotry within the sects? Have we ever pondered well the grand facts that the primitive Church was without an authoritatively defined Creed for three hundred years, and still longer without an authoritatively determined Canon, and that these were the years of its saintliest purity, of its most glorious army of martyrs, and of its sublimest territorial triumphs? In this ante-Nicene period it marched victoriously over most of the known world. In the purity and freedom of its spirit it recognized the apostolic writings, though it read innumerable apocryphal books; it held faithfully the essential doctrinal truth, forming it by gradual accretions into what was called the Apostles' Creed, (not as written by the apostles, but as expressing their fundamental teachings,) though the symbol differed in form in different lands. It preserved its spiritual life not by its "orthodoxy," but its orthodoxy by its spiritual life. The later Church has reversed the process. Functional distinctions are good, creeds are good; as matters of expediency they may be necessary in some cases; but as obligative instead of indicative, as authoritative rather than convenient, they are destructive of the liberty wherewith Christ makes us free. They have converted Christianity into hierarchism and dogmatism. Designed for the preservation of orthodoxy, they have become provocatives of heresy. Aiming at the unity of the Church, they have rent it into universal factions. But, most fatal of all their effects, by impairing its catholicity and charity they have impaired its spiritual life, and to a great extent paralyzed its beneficent working power.

Finally, from the vantage ground which we have reached in this discussion, we think we may catch some glimpses of "the Church of the future"—that ideal so eagerly sought in our day. The Methodists, with their growing hosts, the Baptists, with their zeal and their missionary expansion, the "Liberalists," with their "free thought," dream of that glory as their own. We dare not share their illusions. We see a better fate coming for the Church and the world—an era in which good men will look back to our weaknesses and petty and petulant sectarianisms with something of the wonder with which we contemplate the follies of the medieval Church. God will purify us as by fire, fusing and blending us, and bringing us forth a transformed "Church of the future." One thing only are we sure of, that the Church which attains the most individual purity of life, the most charity, and the most working energy, will have the best prestige for the future. Ever still, as of old, is the sublime declaration true that "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."

ART. III.—PETER CARTWRIGHT, AND PREACHING IN THE WEST.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

IN 1856, after a ministry of fifty-three years, Cartwright, yielding to long-continued importunities, decided to publish his autobiography. In his earlier ministry Cartwright kept a journal of his travels, that he might thus record the progress of Methodism; but finding that several of his co-laborers were doing the same, he concluded there was too much writing on the same subject, and abandoned his manuscript to mice and maggots, not troubling himself to make another note.

We cannot too much deplore this decision, and his preface expresses his own regret at it, since it has prevented his giving just order and precision to the existing work. Cartwright's journal would have been far preferable to the book we now have. It would have shown us the preacher in his every-day life, brought us to the scene of his labors, his joys, and sorrows, and would at the same time have presented a picture, taken on

the spot, of the material and moral life of the West at the opening of the century. But now, as Cartwright takes up the pen in later life, he is rather intent upon giving us an *edifying* book than upon recounting the details of his own life. He, indeed, puts these as much as possible out of view, purposing only to glorify his God and his Church. He loves with a true filial affection this Methodist Church, which awakened in his youthful heart the desire for salvation, and which has made a poor pioneer the instrument of so many conversions. He rejoices in all its successes, and laments all the dissensions which embarrass or the defections which weaken it. He gives us a register of the yearly accessions to the Lord's flock, and furnishes a minute account of the labors of the Conferences and of their discussions, to which he listens as if the fate of the universe depended on the movements which agitate a sect of the American Church. With the intent of moral edification, his pen abounds in anecdotes. He makes record of obdurate sinners suddenly converted, of saints backslidden and recovered, of wicked men stricken by the judgments of God, hypocrites unmasked, heretics or atheists confounded.

Every sect has its store of pious narratives where Satan and the rival sects are well abused, and it is specially a book of this order that Cartwright has given us to glorify American Methodism. But here, as might well be expected in a narrative of his own life, while making war against the demon, the Baptists, Unitarians, and Universalists, he cannot avoid sometimes putting himself upon the scene; and so amid the monotony, more moral than amusing, of the narrative, his own powerful and original personality stands forth presented in vivid and piquant traits.

Peter Cartwright was born September 1, 1785, on the banks of the River James, in Virginia. His parents were poor; and his father, who had borne arms during the war of Independence, resolved when peace was made to emigrate to Kentucky with all his family. Having remained some time in Lincoln County, he pushed further on and established himself permanently in Logan County, quite at the outer limits of European settlements, and close upon the present borders of Tennessee. Peter Cartwright therefore knew no other life than that of the pioneers; he grew up in the midst of the woods, and for his

primary education learned only to read, write, and cipher a little. He was ardently devoted to all the amusements of the country, and his father made him the happiest of boys by presenting him with a race-horse and a pack of cards. His mother sorrowed over the dissipated tastes of her son. She was a woman of strict piety; she had been converted to Methodism in Virginia, and she kept herself constantly in cordial relation with the Methodist preachers who visited from time to time this remote corner of Kentucky.

His mother's remonstrances finally awakened conviction in the soul of young Cartwright, and he had been for months in great distress of mind, when a camp-meeting was held some three miles from his father's house. He went thither with the crowd who were attracted by the reputation of the celebrated preacher John Page, and here under the preaching he found relief. He was taken into the Methodist Church at sixteen years of age. His natural ardor soon displayed itself in the direction of religion. At the assemblies which he thenceforth regularly attended he felt irresistibly impelled to speak; he would mount a bench, pray aloud, or make an address, the fervor and emotional tone of which deeply moved his auditors. So some months afterward, at a quarterly meeting in the spring of 1802, the preacher in charge came to him, and, to his great surprise, bestowed upon him a regular exhorter's license. He vainly essayed to decline; the preacher was convinced of Cartwright's call, and made it a case of conscience for him to pursue the ministry. In the autumn of this same year Cartwright's father, in a process of speculation usual with the pioneers, sold his existing establishment and passed beyond the River Cumberland into a region quite new, where cultivation was but just begun. Although his residence was now at least thirty leagues from the route of any preacher, Cartwright did not fail to seek out John Page in order to obtain a certificate of membership for himself and several of his family. Page immediately granted Cartwright a license, which authorized him to travel over the region whither he had emigrated, to convoke meetings, form classes, and, in a word, to organize a circuit, while account of these labors was to be rendered at the quarterly meeting of the following autumn. This was to invest Cartwright, who had yet hardly passed his eighteenth

year, with all the functions of a traveling preacher. The young man shrank from this responsibility; he pleaded the meagerness of his education and his need of further preparatory study. Page responded that preaching would be the best school for him. During the winter he could do nothing on the farm; he might then pass the time at a school if one were accessible; but on the opening of spring, as soon as it was possible to travel, he must put himself upon his work of preaching and leave the result to the Lord. The young man could not avoid compliance; he felt, indeed, an inward fire which was devouring him, and which must have vent. He went to Lexington and studied in the academy, where, besides the elements of an ordinary education, the dead languages were taught. Here he studied with eagerness, but his stay was short; his severe manners and strict life invited much persecution, and he gladly returned home to prepare for his mission. These few months at Lexington furnished all the regular education that Cartwright received. Let it not, however, be supposed that he remained an illiterate man. All his leisure hours were thenceforth devoted to study; he pursued his reading during winter and on his travels under direction of older brethren in the ministry; and besides acquiring with such aid, a knowledge of the dead languages and of theology, he studied privately law, mathematics, and natural philosophy.

Cartwright at first regarded his mission as only a local and temporary one; but the success which followed his first year's efforts caused him to look upon it differently. The elder on the circuit was not willing to lose so valuable a recruit; he went to Cartwright's father, and in the name of religion besought him to let his son devote himself to the ministry. It was a great sacrifice for a pioneer to lose the labor of a son at eighteen who was tall, robust, intelligent, and an excellent plowman. Therefore the father refused; but the mother, whose conscience was alarmed at the idea of resisting so manifest a call of God, intervened, and obtained by her entreaties the desired consent. Cartwright himself was very hesitant. If he found it a joy to preach in his own neighborhood, to renounce his home-life for the rough experiences of an itinerant was another thing. His mother decided him.

Behold, then, this child of the woods, apparently destined

only to wield the mattock and the ax, now, without a previous thought of it, and, with no preparation, enrolled, almost despite himself, under the banner of militant Methodism. Whether he has well discharged his trust the *résumé* which he himself makes of his labors may show:

I have traveled eleven circuits and twelve districts; have received into the Methodist Episcopal Church, on probation and by letter, 10,000; have baptized, of children, 8,000; of adults, 4,000. For fifty-three years, whenever appointed to a circuit or district, I formed a plan, and named every place where and when I preached; and also the text of Scripture from which I preached; the number of conversions, of baptisms, and the number that joined the Church. From these old plans, though there are some imperfections, yet I can come very near stating the number of times that I have tried to preach. For twenty years of my early ministry I often preached twice a day, and sometimes three times. We seldom ever had, in those days, more than one rest day in a week; so that I feel very safe in saying that I preached four hundred times a year. This would make, in twenty years, eight thousand sermons. For the last thirty-three years, I think I am safe in saying I have averaged four sermons a week, or at least two hundred sermons a year, making, in thirty-three years, 6,600. Total, 14,600.

Cartwright's success honored the judgment of John Page, who had seen in him a popular preacher. His extreme youth imparted an additional attraction to his speech. There was soon but one opinion of him in the West, and the people flocked from great distances to hear the *Kentucky boy*. He himself spared no travel nor labor. One of his first circuits embraced a large part of Ohio, having not less than a hundred leagues circumference. Cartwright was obliged to cross the Ohio River four times at each quarterly round.

He had often still more extended circuits, and must travel over one hundred and fifty leagues to be present at the annual conferences of the preachers. During fifty-three years he missed only one of these conferences by reason of sickness. His allowance as salary was \$80 a year, and very often he did not receive half of it, and would have lacked the necessities of life without assistance from his family. Many preachers after some years of this hard experience abandoned their pursuit, located, and adopted some occupation which would afford a living. Cartwright, unmoved by discouragement, looked upon

his empty purse without fear, and trusted in Providence to fill it.

I had been from my father's house about three years; was five hundred miles from home; my horse had gone blind; my saddle was worn out; my bridle reins had been eaten up and replaced (after a sort) at least a dozen times; and my clothes had been patched till it was difficult to detect the original. I had concluded to try to make my way home and get another outfit. I was in Marietta, and had just seventy-five cents in my pocket. How I would get home and pay my way I could not tell.

But it was of no use to parley about it; go I must, or do worse; so I concluded to go as far as I could, and then stop and work for more means, till I got home. I had some few friends on the way, but not many; so I cast ahead.

My first day's travel was through my circuit. At about thirty-five miles' distance there lived a brother with whom I intended to stay all night. I started, and late in the evening, within five miles of my stopping-place, fell in with a widow lady, not a member of the Church, who lived several miles off my road. She had attended my appointments in that settlement all the year. After the usual salutations, she asked me if I was leaving the circuit.

I told her I was, and had started for my father's.

"Well," said she, "how are you off for money? I expect you have received but little on this circuit."

I told her I had but seventy-five cents in the world. She invited me home with her, and told me she would give me a little to help me on. But I told her I had my places fixed to stop every night till I got to Maysville; and if I went home with her it would derange all my stages, and throw me among strangers. She then handed me a dollar, saying it was all she had with her, but if I would go home with her she would give me more. I declined going with her, thanked her for the dollar, bade her farewell, moved on, and reached my lodging-place.

By the time I reached the Ohio River, opposite Maysville, my money was all gone. I was in trouble about how to get over the river, for I had nothing to pay my ferriage.

I was acquainted with Brother J. Armstrong, a merchant in Maysville, and concluded to tell the ferry-man that I had no money, but if he would ferry me over I could borrow twenty-five cents from Armstrong, and would pay him. Just as I got to the bank of the river he landed, on my side, with a man and a horse; and when the man reached the bank I saw it was Colonel M. Shelby, brother to Governor Shelby, of Kentucky. He was a lively exhorter in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and an old acquaintance and neighbor of my father's.

When he saw me he exclaimed,

"Peter, is that you?"

"Yes, Moses," said I, "what little is left of me."

"Well," said he, "from your appearance you must have seen hard times. Are you trying to get home?"

"Yes," I answered.

"How are you off for money, Peter?" said he.

"Well, Moses," said I, "I have not a cent in the world."

"Well," said he, "here are three dollars, and I will give you a bill of the road and a letter of introduction till you get down into the barrens at the Pilot Knob."

You may be sure my spirits greatly rejoiced. So I passed on very well for several days and nights on the colonel's money and credit, but when I came to the first tavern beyond the Pilot Knob my money was out. What to do I did not know, but I rode up and asked for quarters. I told the landlord I had no money; had been three years from home, and was trying to get back to my father's. I also told him I had a little old watch, and a few good books in my saddle-bags, and I would compensate him in some way. He bade me alight and be easy.

Cartwright saw the conversion of the tavern keeper who would take nothing from him; he met still other friends, and found new converts who were glad to entertain him gratuitously.

Next day I reached home with six and a quarter cents unexpended. Thus I have given you a very imperfect little sketch of the early travel of a Methodist preacher in the Western Conference. My parents received me joyfully. I tarried with them several weeks. My father gave me a fresh horse, a bridle and saddle, some new clothes, and forty dollars in cash. Thus equipped, I was ready for another three years' absence.

See this man, always ready and always cheerful, as he strives to obey the precept, "Be instant in season and out of season." He feels, indeed, a little hesitation when he is sent, for the first time, to preach to the *Yankees*, since he had never seen one, and these people were supposed to be special enemies to religious zeal, very orderly and ceremonious in their habits, accustomed to fine language, and quick to criticise; but seeing that duty calls, he goes forth boldly to confront these sharp tongues. At the least invitation, or even at the slightest chance of winning a soul, he mounts a table, a bench, or trunk of a tree, and begins to preach. If traveling in a public conveyance, he draws the conversation to the subject of religion, and is sure to make some converts among his companions. If he asks the hospitality of a house, he solicits permission to pray with and for the occupants. If an infidel host locks him into his chamber, he begins to pray with a loud voice, so that

the sound awakens the Christian sympathy of the infidel's wife. Nothing discourages him, nothing wearies him; he can preach three days and three nights if it is necessary; but he never leaves a place without success in the work of God. Of all the scenes in which he has figured, perhaps the most interesting is the following, which might be entitled "The Preacher at the Ball."

Saturday night came on, and found me in a strange region of country, and in the hills, knobs, and spurs of the Cumberland Mountains. I greatly desired to stop on the approaching Sabbath, and spend it with a Christian people; but I was now in a region of country where there was no Gospel minister for many miles around, and where, as I learned, many of the scattered population had never heard a Gospel sermon in all their lives, and where the inhabitants knew no Sabbath only to hunt and visit, drink and dance. Thus lonesome and pensive, late in the evening, I hailed at a tolerably decent house, and the landlord kept entertainment. I rode up and asked for quarters. The gentleman said I could stay, but he was afraid I would not enjoy myself very much as a traveler, inasmuch as they had a party meeting there that night to have a little dance. I inquired how far it was to a decent house of entertainment on the road; he said seven miles. I told him if he would treat me civilly and feed my horse well, by his leave I would stay. He assured me I should be treated civilly. I dismounted and went in. The people collected, a large company. I saw there was not much drinking going on.

I quietly took my seat in one corner of the house, and the dance commenced. I sat quietly musing, a total stranger, and greatly desired to preach to this people. Finally, I concluded to spend the next day (Sabbath) there, and ask the privilege to preach to them. I had hardly settled this point in my mind, when a beautiful, ruddy young lady walked very gracefully up to me, dropped a handsome courtesy, and pleasantly, with winning smiles, invited me out to take a dance with her. I can hardly describe my thoughts or feelings on that occasion. However, in a moment I resolved on a desperate experiment. I rose as gracefully as I could; I will not say with some emotion, but with many emotions. The young lady moved to my right side; I grasped her right hand with my right hand, while she leaned her left arm on mine. In this position we walked on the floor. The whole company seemed pleased at this act of politeness in the young lady, shown to a stranger. The colored man, who was the fiddler, began to put his fiddle in the best order. I then spoke to the fiddler to hold a moment, and added that for several years I had not undertaken any matter of importance without first asking the blessing of God upon it, and I desired now to ask the blessing of God upon this beautiful young lady and the

whole company, that had shown such an act of politeness to a total stranger.

Here I grasped the young lady's hand tightly, and said, "Let us all kneel down and pray," and then instantly dropped on my knees, and commenced praying with all the power of soul and body that I could command. The young lady tried to get loose from me, but I held her tight. Presently she fell on her knees. Some of the company kneeled, some stood, some fled, some sat still, all looked curious. The fiddler ran off into the kitchen, saying, "Lord a marcy, what de matter? what is dat mean?"

While I prayed some wept, and wept out aloud, and some cried for mercy. I rose from my knees and commenced an exhortation, after which I sang a hymn. The young lady who invited me on the floor lay prostrate, crying earnestly for mercy. I exhorted again, I sang and prayed nearly all night. About fifteen of that company professed religion, and our meeting lasted next day and next night, and as many more were powerfully converted.

It is a fine thing to see Cartwright contending for his converts with the preachers of other sects, especially the Baptists, who came to glean behind him, and who sought to gain a part of his flock. He had a thousand devices to bring these trespassers into all kinds of snares, and to cover them with confusion. When he takes the offensive he uses the same skill in attack as in defense. If he is unknown in the region he will play the rôle of a convert seeking instruction, and by question after question in the Socratic method he will come to show up the absurdity of his teachers' doctrine. These are the battles and victories in which he delights; but speak not to him of other conquests, nor think that he cares in the least for the great things of this world. One day as he was preaching in a brother's church on this text, "For what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" he felt some one twitching his coat, and heard the brother minister whisper in his ear, "General Jackson has just come in." Cartwright was greatly vexed at this officious movement, and spoke out so that all could hear, "Who is General Jackson? If he is not converted God will damn him as surely as the lowest negro." Great was the trepidation of the minister, who took Cartwright to task after the service, and assured him that the general would not fail to chastise his insolence. "I don't believe it," said Cartwright; "the general will rather approve my conduct; but if he should undertake any thing like

chastisement, there would be two of us at that game, as the proverb runs."

Thereupon the minister goes of his own accord to excuse the matter with the general, who seems not to have been much pleased with the interference, for on meeting Cartwright afterward in the street he at once accosted him, saying, "Mr. Cartwright, you are a man after my own heart. I am much surprised that any one could have supposed me offended at you. I can only approve your independence; a minister of Jesus Christ ought to love every body and fear no mortal man. If I only had a few thousand officers as independent and fearless as you, and a good army, I could conquer England." Since human nature is always the same, Cartwright, after having reported this incident, so flattering to himself, could not help adding, "General Jackson is certainly a most extraordinary man."

It was at the camp-meeting that Cartwright found himself in his element; but here, especially, he needed all that resolution which General Jackson so much admired in him. These great multitudes inspired him, and the idea of the good to be accomplished transported and bore him up against all fatigue. All day long he preached, sang hymns, and exhorted the preachers who flocked around him; by night he watched and prayed, seemingly forgetful of all repose, although the camp-meetings were prolonged for a week or more. And what holy indignation, what commanding power he displayed against those who sought to impede the work of God! Peddlers would establish themselves in the vicinity and offer spirituous liquors for sale. Cartwright sought out the magistrates, and by easy or importunate persuasion obtained orders for the removal of the sellers. If the silence of the law were pleaded, and liberty claimed for such nuisances, he would take the lead, and the people in force would carry off the liquor, putting it safely under lock and key till the breaking up of the camp. Families which came in a body to the camp often embraced some members, young people particularly, who, with little or no interest in religious matters, came simply out of curiosity and for the sake of amusement. There were others who declared open hostility to those meetings, and prided themselves upon making as much disturbance as possible. They would collect frogs

and throw them among the crowd at the most pathetic passages of the sermon; they would conspire to throw fire-crackers into the camp at night, to catch the preachers and toss them in blankets, or to draw a wagon occupied by sleepers into the quagmire

Cartwright happily kept good watch; he posted his sentinels, and he himself often went the rounds. Whoever came about for mischief at such times was only too glad to get away with all speed. A certain scapegrace, who had sworn to turn a preacher's wagon into the river, was about to accomplish his design, when he suddenly found himself seized by the collar. Cartwright, who, armed with a stout club, had caught the rogue, took him straight to the water and gave him, under threat of a drubbing, a forced bath. Sometimes Cartwright would come to an understanding with his enemies: he would transform some of them into allies; would bring them into a treaty to guarantee the tranquillity of his camp on condition of being allowed to carry on their diversions at a distance. One day when some rude fellows had in this manner become the defenders of order, there came a young fop, proud of his long hair, frizzed and curled in the latest fashion, who insisted upon sitting on the side reserved for the ladies. As no persuasion could induce him to move, Cartwright claimed the promised service, and the young fellow was seized by the preacher's new allies, taken beyond the circle and closely cropped. Sometimes, it is true, great animosity and passion were manifested; no peaceable agreement was possible, and force alone could secure quiet for the assembly. Cartwright never hesitated, was intimidated by no menace, and was the first to incur personal danger.

Our last quarterly meeting was a camp-meeting. We had a great many tents, and a large turn-out for a new country, and, perhaps, there never was a greater collection of rabble and rowdies. They came drunk, and armed with dirks, clubs, knives, and horse-whips, and swore they would break up the meeting. After interrupting us very much on Saturday night, they collected early on Sunday morning, determined on a general riot. At eight o'clock I was appointed to preach. About the time I was half through my discourse two very fine-dressed young men marched into the congregation with loaded whips, and hats on, and rose up and stood in the midst of the ladies, and began to laugh and talk. They were near the stand, and I requested

them to desist and get off the seats; but they cursed me and told me to mind my own business, and said they would not get down. I stopped trying to preach, and called for a magistrate. There were two at hand, but I saw they were both afraid. I ordered them to take these men into custody, but they said they could not do it. I told them, as I left the stand, to command me to take them, and I would do it at the risk of my life. I advanced toward them. They ordered me to stand off, but I advanced. One of them made a pass at my head with his whip, but I closed in with him and jerked him off the seat. A regular scuffle ensued. The congregation by this time were all in commotion. I heard the magistrates give general orders, commanding all friends of order to aid in suppressing the riot. In the scuffle I threw my prisoner down, and held him fast; he tried his best to get loose; I told him to be quiet, or I would pound his chest well. The mob rose and rushed to the rescue of the two prisoners, for they had taken the other young man also. An old and drunken magistrate came up to me, and ordered me to let my prisoner go. I told him I should not. He swore if I did not he would knock me down. I told him to crack away. Then one of my friends at my request took hold of my prisoner, and the drunken justice made a pass at me; but I parried the stroke, and seized him by the collar and the hair of the head, and fetching him a sudden jerk forward brought him to the ground and jumped on him. I told him to be quiet or I would pound him well. The mob then rushed to the scene; they knocked down seven magistrates and several preachers and others. I gave up my drunken prisoner to another, and threw myself in front of the friends of order. Just at this moment the ringleader of the mob and I met; he made three passes at me, intending to knock me down. The last time he struck at me, by the force of his own effort he threw the side of his face toward me. It seemed at that moment I had not power to resist temptation, and I struck a sudden blow in the burr of the ear and dropped him to the earth. Just at that moment the friends of order rushed by hundreds on the mob, knocking them down in every direction. In a few minutes the place became too strait for the mob, and they wheeled and fled in every direction; but we secured about thirty prisoners, marched them off to a vacant tent, and put them under guard till Monday morning, when they were tried, and every man was fined to the utmost limits of the law. The aggregate amount of fines and costs was near three hundred dollars. They fined my old drunken magistrate twenty dollars, and returned him to court, and he was cashiered of his office.

It is easy to suppose that such a conflict would throw all minds into agitation, and it would seem impossible to restore calmness in a multitude so heated with the struggle; no preacher would undertake to speak. Cartwright alone, whose

conscience was clear because he believed he had but done his duty and followed the demands of necessity, seemed to rise above the general dejection; he sought the presiding elder, who was more discouraged than all others, and requested the privilege of preaching. The trumpet called the assembly; he mounted the platform, took for his text, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," and at the end of half an hour the power of God, according to his favorite phrase, was felt in the whole congregation. This energetic and decided character, who knew how to secure advantage in the most unfavorable circumstances, whom the most unforeseen occurrences found always prepared, would be specially pleasing to the easily swayed population of the West, in whose eyes force, whether moral or physical, was the certain sign of superiority. The facility with which Cartwright passed from grave to gay, his fertility in anecdote and similitude, his cutting sarcasm and sudden bursts of impetuosity, even his eccentricities, all were in contrast with the solemn and set manners of the ordinary preachers, all charmed and captivated the multitude. He was without equal as a purely extemporaneous speaker; he must be inspired by the sight of a crowd, by some view of nature, or some special circumstances, and the preparations of closet study availed him little. The General Conference was once held in Boston, and the Methodists, whom the other sects affected somewhat to despise as an uncultured class, felt called upon to present a good figure in a city like the Athens of America. They sought to put forward the flower of their pulpit talent, and counted specially upon Cartwright. The latter was well impressed with the importance of sustaining not only his own reputation and the honor of the Church, but that also of the Western people, and took great pains to prepare two sermons. The Bostonians only said that he preached like others. Mortified at such a judgment, he set out the third time in utter freedom from preparation, preached as if he were in the woods, and achieved immense success.

With so much popularity as he enjoyed in the West, Cartwright might have aspired to any civil honor; but he always kept himself out of politics, and if he once sought the suffrages of his fellow-citizens it was from conviction of duty. He had settled with his family in Illinois, when the Legislature was

hesitating about the repeal of the law abolishing slavery. Cartwright readily allowed himself to be chosen as deputy that he might speak and vote against the repeal, and as soon as victory was secured he refused to be longer a candidate. He seems to have conceived during his short civil career an unfavorable notion of the prevalent political morality. He had specially a bitter memory of his own treatment in the attacks to which he was subject from the moment of his appearing as a candidate. He was even accused of refusing to pay his debts and of perjury. He treated his political adversaries in the same style as he did his religious opponents, and with like success. Meeting one day a voter who had sworn to give him a horse-whipping, Cartwright made himself known, said he did not wish to live in perpetual apprehension, and demanded of his adversary the immediate execution of his menace. At the same time he rolled up his sleeves ready for the encounter, but thereupon was only met by the proffer of his opponent's hand in reconciliation, and the latter was subsequently his warmest partisan.

A General Conference of the American Methodist Church was held at Indianapolis in 1857. The English Methodists were then represented by a delegate, Dr. Jobson, who saw and heard Cartwright, then in his seventy-third year, and he gives the following account of him:

"The second person in the assembly in weight of years is Dr. Peter Cartwright, a tall, robust man, whose physiognomy and speech both betray a mingling of primitive simplicity with a large touch of humor. His flesh, solid as marble, his rough and determined air, bespeak a man of intrepidity and habituation to fatigue. Yet the signs of good humor and kindness are not wanting, for his mouth, eyes, and mobile cheeks show a sympathetic and tender nature. His head is strong, and reposes firmly upon large and robust shoulders; his forehead is large, and covered with a forest of gray hair. His eyes, of very deep color, gleam like two fires under the bristling eyebrows, and the two wrinkles seen at the corners present a marked feature in his physiognomy. His skin is much browned by the sun. His voice trembles when he begins to speak, but soon he recovers his old power, and the rich tones of the organ are at his command. The orator appears in it

and plays skillfully all its chords. At times, to sharpen his darts and make them more penetrating, he assumes derisively a tragic tone and air; then, after having related some anecdote which convulses his auditors with laughter, while nothing of his own solemn gravity is lost, he falls upon his antagonist with an irresistible vigor and crushes him with sarcasm. Is he aroused by the presence of numerous opponents, he sends forth, stroke upon stroke, keen arguments, arrows lively and burning like lightning; then, with voice unchecked as a tempest in the woods, he bursts out in oburgations and reproaches in such force as to overbear his antagonists and fill his hearers with a kind of terror. He seems to have received a special mission to pursue and cover with confusion the innovators who would put the institutions of Methodism in peril. He performs this duty with all the ardor of a forest huntsman, and spares neither bishops, delegates, nor presiding elders, nor ministers, nor laymen. He does terrible execution sometimes, and appears at the tribune of the Conference as intrepid and irresistible as the lion in his own domain. His name alone would draw multitudes to a camp-meeting; and under that voice, powerful, musical, and resonant as a trumpet, and which by turns grows soft or threatening as he deplores the sinner's condition or announces his punishment, the multitude bow their heads, and are swayed like the grass of the prairies beneath the wind."

This account shows us Cartwright as the determined adversary of all innovation; he himself records all the contests in which he has engaged at the General Conferences. Every thing in the Church to which he devoted his life is sacred to him; he is unwilling that its rules and organization be changed, lest by this means its spirit and fruitfulness should suffer. It is not only the ancient rules that he defends, but he regrets also the old times, usages, and manners.

We had no Missionary Society; no Sunday-School Society; no Church papers; no Bible or Tract Societies; no colleges, seminaries, academies, or universities; all the efforts to get up colleges under the patronage of the Methodist Episcopal Church in these United States and Territories were signal failures. We had no pewed churches, no choirs, no organs; in a word, we had no instrumental music in our churches-anywhere. The Methodists in that early day dressed plain; attended their meetings faithfully,

especially preaching, prayer and class meetings; they wore no jewelry, no ruffles; they would frequently walk three or four miles to class-meeting, and home again, on Sundays; they would go thirty or forty miles to their quarterly meetings, and think it a glorious privilege to meet their presiding elder, and the rest of the preachers. They could, nearly every soul of them, sing out hymns and spiritual songs. They religiously kept the Sabbath day; many of them abstained from dram-drinking, not because the temperance reformation was ever heard of in that day, but because it was interdicted in the General Rules of our Discipline. The Methodists of that day stood up and faced their preacher when they sung; they kneeled down in the public congregation as well as elsewhere, when the preacher said, "Let us pray." There was no standing among the members in time of prayer, especially the abominable practice of sitting down during that exercise was unknown among early Methodists. Parents did not allow their children to go to balls or plays; they did not send them to dancing-schools; they generally fasted once a week, and almost universally on the Friday before each quarterly meeting. If the Methodists had dressed in the same "superfluity of naughtiness" then as they do now, there were very few even out of the Church that would have any confidence in their religion. But O, how have things changed for the worse in this educational age of the world!

There is no better justification than this of what Horace has said concerning old men, and one could not in higher degree appear as *laudator temporis acti*. It is unreasonable to make the matter of salvation depend on costume, or to see in any particular choice of diet an invincible obstacle to the practice of virtue. Nevertheless, if we are to pardon this hostility to luxury and the refinements of civilization, we may especially do so in a child of the woods, recognizing also that there is in the complaints of Cartwright a basis of truth: Having seen the days of vigor in Methodism, the aged preacher has lived to see the commencement of its decay.

The fecundity of Methodism, as we have striven to show, lies chiefly in its organization, which had for its object to develop and nourish the spirit of propagandism. It called forth unceasingly within the mass of adherents new apostles whose efforts were assured of at least a temporary success, and whose zeal might reanimate the general torpor. There was a constant mutual stimulation on the part of clergy and laity. The system of rotation in circuits was in this respect beneficial, for, by bringing preachers and audience together who had not

had opportunity to familiarize themselves with each other, it demanded unusual effort on the one side, and rendered attention more easy on the other through the incitement of novelty. In fine, the itinerancy of the preachers, the facility of the arrangement for establishing class leaders and exhorters, allowed Methodism to make its influence felt in every place and at all times, and in this view we may say that Wesley bestowed upon Protestantism an element of force, and a lever analogous to that secured by the religious orders in the Catholic Church. Statistics alone can show in full the propagating energy of Methodism and the rapidity of its progress. When the Methodist Church was organized at the Baltimore Conference it counted eighty-six preachers and a little less than fifteen thousand members; in 1843, sixty years later, there were four thousand itinerant preachers, more than one million communicants, and the number of attendants upon its services was reckoned at five millions in addition. While the most prosperous of the other sects had increased simply tenfold, Methodism had grown in the proportion of one to seventy-one. Now, its ratio of increase follows, if it does not surpass, that of the general population.

But in England, Methodism has nearly lost the spirit and propagating energy which Wesley sought to impart to his society. Not only has individual activity declined because of the greater frequency and facility of public effort which has put an end to private assemblies and spontaneous preaching, but a revolution has taken place in the ministry. If in the Catholic Church, despite the obligation to celibacy and the vow of poverty, all the religious orders have fallen into degeneracy, and have only recovered themselves by successive reformatory movements, it is yet more to be expected that the tendency to become stationary, to adopt a more settled life in place of the fatigue and uncertainties of the itinerancy, would prevail with a Protestant clergy who are married, and with whom the cares of a family qualify the force of religious zeal. To-day beside each English church stands the Methodist chapel; in one is a minister, in the other a preacher. The two clergy and the two Churches live the same life, hardly separated by the slightest differences. A like transformation is being accomplished in Canada, where the itinerants are

allowed to remain in each circuit five years, and where the increase of preachers diminishes each year the dimensions of the circuits. The same causes must operate to produce the same effect in the United States.

The change is already sufficiently marked to have attracted the attention of Cartwright. Despite his love and prejudice for his Church, the aged preacher perceives that American Methodism has already undergone profound alterations, and he deploras every change as a prognostic of ruin. Although the Asburys and M'Kendrees, and the founders of the sect generally, were voluntarily given to celibacy, Cartwright, himself married, and conscious of never having neglected his duties as a preacher, cannot see in the marriage of the clergy one of the most active causes of the decadence which threatens his Church. He searches, indeed, in almost every direction for causes of this degeneracy, and readily finds such in what he calls the infatuation of the age for education. It is easy to see that he is no friend to the institutions where they make preachers by the dozen, and he thrusts his sarcasms most heartily at ministers who are too fond of *belles-lettres*. Thus in his preface he expresses the hope that his book will serve a better purpose than to satisfy a vain curiosity, or simply try the fastidious taste of fine-spoken ministers, who, by the fortune of the times and abundance of books, have found advantages for education. Cartwright does not hesitate to say that if the preaching is less effective than formerly it is because the ministers have become so highly educated as to lose their sacred fire and source of inspiration:

Right here I wish to say, (I hope without the charge of egotism,) when I consider the insurmountable disadvantages and difficulties that the early pioneer Methodist preachers labored under in spreading the Gospel in these Western wilds in the great valley of the Mississippi, and contrast the disabilities which surrounded them on every hand with the glorious human advantages that are enjoyed by their present successors, it is confoundingly miraculous to me that our modern preachers cannot preach better, and do more good than they do. Many nights, in early times, the itinerant had to camp out, without fire or food for man or beast. Our pocket Bible, Hymn Book, and Discipline constituted our library. It is true we could not, many of us, conjugate a verb or parse a sentence, and murdered the king's English almost every lick. But there was a Divine unction attended the word preached, and thousands fell under the mighty power of God, and thus the

Methodist Episcopal Church was planted firmly in this Western wilderness, and many glorious signs have followed, and will follow, to the end of time.

A danger which Cartwright points out with greater reason is the very result of the Church's progress. In proportion as Methodism has increased its numbers and wealth, it has been called upon to satisfy more extensive demands, and has sought to put itself upon a level with other Churches. Therefore it has founded seminaries to instruct its clergy, and colleges to recruit its seminaries; it has established journals for the promotion of its interests and for controversy; it has instituted associations and business enterprises for the publication and spread of its literature. Each of these establishments, which are constantly multiplied, involves the creation of numerous positions which add to the attractions of a settled life the advantage of a comfortable remuneration, and which naturally claim the best talent. Since it were impossible to exclude from the Church men who are an honor to it and its apparent chief strength, these continually multiplying occupants of the local positions are maintained in all the prerogatives of the ministry. Cartwright complains of seeing men vote in the Conferences who have never had charge of a circuit, know nothing of the life and wants of a preacher, and have indeed, perchance, never once preached. He anticipates with dread the day when these dignitaries of settled position shall constitute a majority in the Conferences, and shall give law to the preachers.

Whenever, indeed, this inevitable revolution shall be accomplished, Methodism will be destroyed in its very essence; it will cease to be a militant Church, a nursery of propagandism; nothing will distinguish it from the innumerable sects which spring up around it, and which are constantly enfeebled by the spirit of schism. Cartwright's fears are therefore legitimate; but no one can arrest the course of Methodism in the fatal decline to which the force of circumstances impel it. When a Church has not that immovable basis to which the Roman Church lays claim, it is obliged to be compliant and suit the times, even if it must, in order to live, sacrifice the very sources of its life. Cartwright laments that the camp-meeting scenes of his own triumph are now quite fallen into des-

netude; but this is a change well enough explained by the very notion he himself gives us of that institution. Many other changes will take place, and will be, like that, the natural result of certain transformations occurring in the United States. The population is denser, and, taking on the milder manners of civilization, it has more regular customs and wants quite different from those of a widely scattered and half-civilized people. Why should you go into the woods to hear preaching which solicits attention just at your door? Why should a well-settled and rich community be compelled to await the return of an evangelist to have its children baptized, its marriages and the sacraments celebrated, when at a little sacrifice it may erect a church in its midst and establish there a pastor well known to all? The Mississippi valley is filled to-day with large towns, some of which have a population above one hundred thousand; with such populous cities new necessities are presented which Methodism must meet, and this Church, having been already, at an early day, established in the new territory, counts now, without doubt, the largest number of its adherents in the towns. A settled population necessarily implies a settled clergy. From this change in circumstances has sprung and proceeds daily the transformation of American Methodism. While the settled institutions of this Church grow, and its ministry becomes to a greater extent educated; while its endowments of all sorts are being multiplied and enriched, its original work of evangelism will by degrees decline and come to occupy a subordinate place, as in the other Churches. Meanwhile the course of emigration still pursues its way toward the Pacific, and the perils and necessities of the pioneers are not less than before. But now upon their track comes the Catholic missionary. Since it set foot in the United States in following the Irish emigration, the Catholic Church has made marvelous progress in the West. It has its regular clergy for the towns, its religious orders for the floating and scattered populations, and, thanks to the twofold militia which it unceasingly recruits in both hemispheres! it will perhaps inherit in the Mississippi valley the place which the Methodist Church has for nearly a century filled.

ART. IV.—THE KU KLUX CONSPIRACY.*

It is generally conceded that the victorious party in our late war acted toward the vanquished with unprecedented generosity. When General Lee tendered his sword under the apple-tree at Appomattox it was with the most serious apprehensions as to himself and the other rebel leaders. But the first item of General Grant's terms was that all officers should retain their side-arms, implying that the conqueror desired to inflict as little humiliation as possible. But still more generous was the next provision, which declared "that each officer and soldier is permitted to return to his home, there to remain undisturbed so long as he obeys the laws of the land where he resides." Here was complete amnesty to the entire army; and afterward, when President Andrew Johnson was seized with his spasm to make treason odious, and proposed to try General Lee for levying war against the nation, General Grant interposed a negative on the ground that he was a paroled soldier, and his parole could not be broken.

Then, after the terms were signed, and General Lee, remembering that many of his artillery horses belonged to the men, and that it would be a great hardship to surrender them, came hesitatingly to represent the case to General Grant, saying, "But it is too late; the papers are signed. General Grant said, 'No matter about the papers;'" and at once wrote the order for retaining the horses, "because," said he, "they will need them for the spring plowing."

Since the close of the war no man's property has been confiscated on account of his connection with the rebellion, and no man has been executed for treason. Nor has Congress ever hesitated to grant amnesty whenever it has been asked. It has not only freely granted all such requests, but has also passed a general bill relieving all persons from their disabilities except members of the Thirty-sixth and Thirty-seventh Congresses, the cabinet ministers of that period, judges of the United States

* Report of the Joint Select Committee appointed to inquire into the condition of affairs in the late Insurrectionary States so far as regards the execution of the laws, and the safety of the lives and property of the citizens of the United States. Senate of the United States, February 19, 1872.

Courts, and the officers of our army and navy who went into the rebellion. Probably, in all, not over two hundred persons.

Nor is it easy to see that there are any reasonable grounds of complaint against the victors on account of their terms of reconstruction. The war had emancipated the slaves, and the people had, by the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment, made them citizens. They were consequently entitled to the ordinary rights of citizens; and when we demanded, as one of the conditions of self-government, that they should make all their citizens equal before the law, and give them equal political rights, we required only what had been conceded in all the free States, and what was set forth in our great Declaration of Independence as the basis of all just and equitable government, namely, that the newly-organized States should "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

But however reasonable this requirement may have been, it was so directly against Southern pride and Southern prejudice as to be well-nigh intolerable. Under the old order government embraced the white population only, and the rights of the slaves were wholly disregarded. They had no voice in public affairs, nor even in their own affairs, and no independent power in the case "of life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness."

But when society was reorganized on the basis of the reconstruction acts, and governments were established which recognized the late slaves as citizens and voters, while, at the same time, a considerable portion of the old ruling class were disfranchised on account of their participation in the rebellion, the effect was to turn society "bottom upward," and to put the government in the hands of the emancipated slaves.

But these new citizens were ignorant and incapable, and must, in the nature of things, lean on others; and as men from the North had fought for and achieved their emancipation, and were engaged in establishing schools among them, and in looking after their improvement, they turned from their old masters and took counsel and direction from the Northern men who had come among them since the war. Hence arose the power and consideration of that much-abused class of persons known as Carpet-baggers. Many of them were undoubtedly narrow enough, and selfish enough; but a still greater evil was the prejudice which they fostered between the freedmen and the old

ruling class. The effect of their intercourse with the negroes was to encourage them to lay aside their demeanor of deference, and to come forward and claim a share of the honors and offices hitherto enjoyed only by the white race.

This was a state of things deeply mortifying to Southern pride, and against which it strongly revolted. "Nigger" had always been an expression of supremest contempt. As a slave the negro "had no rights which a white man was bound to respect." Emancipated, it was supposed that in time he might grow into some intelligence and consideration. But to make him an equal at once, to put him in positions of honor and profit, to have him in the seats of authority, laying down the law to the white man, touched Southern pride to the quick, and aroused the most intense feeling of disgust.

But what, more than any thing else, intensified this feeling, was the fact that while the planters had no influence whatever with the new voters, the adventurers from the North, whom they so heartily despised—schoolmasters, ministers, agents of the Freedmen's Bureau, little traders who had come among them to "turn an honest penny"—not only controlled them, but so controlled them as to make them a political power directly antagonistic to their old masters.

For this state of things there seemed to be no remedy. In most of the States the negroes and the few white men who acted with them constituted the voting majority; and hence they had more or less power over both legislation and administration. The negro could not, therefore, be taught "to know his place" by any process of court procedure. The law was what he appealed to. The law was on his side. Still it was clear enough that he was all wrong; that he was getting impudent and above his condition; that he had lost his deference for the old master race, and that society needed some correction outside of the law to bring it back to a tolerable condition.

With a knowledge of this state of facts it will be easy to understand why the Ku-Klux idea took such instant and deep hold of the Southern mind. The best classes of persons saw in it exactly what was needed to correct what they regarded as the abuses of the reconstruction acts. Through it they could punish negro impudence and negro ambition, and teach their old slaves to know their place. They could also administer a

wholesome check to carpet-bag assumptions, and let these radicals understand that they must return the ruling power to the ruling class, who were entitled to it by nativity, education, intelligence, and experience. These were objects which in their view needed to be accomplished, and the Ku-Klux Klan promised to accomplish them. No doubt there were excesses which the better classes did not approve; but they sympathized so strongly with the objects to be attained, that these excesses were either overlooked, or approved as necessary evils which the correction of society amply justified.

In the laborious investigation instituted by Congress, embracing a vast amount of testimony, taken largely on the spot, and printed in thirteen ponderous volumes, it is apparent throughout that this great conspiracy had the countenance and support of the old ruling class. On this point the evidence is abundant, and is fairly epitomized by General Butler, of South Carolina, when he says: "Until influential men, men who have the right to express an opinion, are allowed to utter a voice, I, for one, do not intend to raise my hand against it. I say, As long as you don't touch my house, shoot and kill as many as you please; and that is the feeling all over the State."

Here is the philosophy of this terrible scourge in a few words. In ordinary cases of wrong-doing society feels that it is injured, and that it must protect itself and punish the wrong-doer. But in the case of these crimes, as they were in the interest of the old master class, they were not against society, as that word was understood by them; and men in high position, like General Butler, regarded the Klan as doing their work, and so shut their eyes and stood aloof, giving the murderers the full benefit of their silent approbation.

General Butler also revealed the feeling of his class toward the freedmen on account of their persistent adherence to the Republican party. He said if the negroes had been let alone they would have attached themselves to their old masters, and been governed by their counsel and advice, and would have voted with them in the elections. The following, on this point, is taken from his testimony:

Question. Then the effect of the relation of master and slave having formerly existed does not prevent the master from acquiring ascendancy over the negro?

Answer. I do not think it does. I think if the master would become a radical he would go for him right off.

Q. You do not say that the former relation of master and slave deprives the native South Carolinian of an influence over the former slave?

A. Not at all.

Q. Have you no idea that the negro is led to that party by his conscientious belief?

A. No, sir. . . . I think it has been drilled into him that the Republican party freed him; that they came here with banners flying and emancipated him. I think all this sort of falsehood has been drilled into him. . . . If a man is a Republican, that is enough, if he is from the penitentiary; but if he is a Democrat, they will have nothing to do with him, whoever he is.

The intensity of this feeling in regard to the negro will explain much that follows. It reveals the true cause of that general hatred of the Republican party which brought the whole force of the Ku-Klux organization against it. The white portion of the Republican party was even more hateful to the planter class than the negroes; because the effect of their intercourse with the negroes was to "set them up," to make them independent, or, in the language of the South, "impudent," and to cause them to lay aside their habits of deference and servility. The Northern portion were "carpet-baggers," and the Southern "scallawags," and both shared alike the general feeling of dislike and disgust.

When it is said that the operations of the Ku-Klux Klans were not against the government, and were not intended to further the objects of separation and independence, as in the late rebellion, the statement is probably true. Although the evidence shows pretty conclusively that the order existed in all the Southern States, that it was in its general aspects military, that it had a general head in the nation, a commander in each State, a sub-commander in each county, and captains over camps or dens, it fails to show any purpose to strike at the government in any other sense than to control and bring into contempt the execution of the reconstruction acts.

In stating the purposes of the order the witnesses all had before their vision Article VIII of the prescript, which swears them not to reveal to any one not a member "any of the secrets, signs, grips, pass-words, mysteries, or *purposes*" of the order, and their statements are consequently divergent and contradic-

tory. But although its purposes are more surely gathered from its conduct than in any other way, there are not wanting very satisfactory statements on this head; and that of James E. Boyd is so important that he must be permitted to speak for himself. He is a respectable lawyer of Graham, Allemanee County, North Carolina, and canvassed his county for the Legislature. He was born in the county, and has resided in the town of Graham for sixteen years. The following is condensed from his testimony:

Question. What knowledge have you of secret political organizations in your county?

Answer. I know of three political organizations that have existed in Allemanee County. The Union League was a Republican organization. I was not a member. Another was the White Brotherhood. I joined it, in the town of Graham, in November, 1868. I was not initiated in a regular camp, as it was called, but in the room of the chief.

Q. Can you give us in detail what the regulations were?

A. The meetings were to be held in secret places—in the woods or some place distant from any habitation, in order to avoid detection. The disguise prescribed was a long white gown, and a mask for the face. No applicant could be admitted till his name had been first submitted to a regular camp. A county was divided into a certain number of districts, and each district composed a camp, which was under the command of a captain. The whole county constituted a Klan, under the command of a chief. No raid was to be made, no person punished, no execution done unless first unanimously agreed upon at a regular meeting of a camp of the Klan and duly approved by the officers and the chief of the Klan. The sign of membership was sliding the right hand down along the opposite lappel of the coat, and the recognition was in the same manner with the left hand. The word for distress was "Shiloh." There was also a sign of distress made by the hand. When a raid was ordered the plan of operation was this: If the person to be punished lived in our vicinity the persons to execute the punishment came from a distant camp, in order the better to avoid detection. When on a raid only one person was allowed to speak, and that one was designated who could best disguise his voice.

Q. Are the members bound to carry out the decrees of the order if they involve murder and assassination?

A. I think so, sir. If it was decided to take the life of a man, a camp is ordered to execute the sentence, and is bound to do it.

Q. If arrests were made by the civil authorities for murder or other crime committed in pursuance of the decrees of a camp, to what extent did the obligations of members bind them to arrest and protect each other?

A. To whatever extent was in their power.

Q. Did it go to the extent of giving testimony in behalf of each other, or of acquitting if upon a jury?

A. I think that was one of the objects; that a person on the witness stand or in the jury box should disregard his oath in order to protect a member.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the number of persons in your county belonging to the organization?

A. Between six and seven hundred, I should suppose. There are, I believe, ten camps in the county, and the camps will average from fifty to seventy-five members each.

Q. What is the population?

A. About four thousand. The voting population is about eighteen or nineteen hundred, and the whites twelve or thirteen hundred.

Q. Then with about eighteen hundred voters in your county you think that six or seven hundred are members of this organization?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your knowledge of the object and extent of this organization throughout the State?

A. I can only state from hearsay. The number is supposed to be forty thousand. The object was the overthrow of the reconstruction policy of Congress, and the disfranchisement of the negro.

Q. What extent of means was to be used to influence elections?

A. We can only judge of that by the manner in which it has operated to influence elections, by riding around in the night time, disguised, to the houses of poor white men and negroes, and informing them that if they went to the election such and such would be their fate—proceedings of that kind; and by whipping, and at the same time informing them that a part, at least, of their offense was having voted the Republican ticket.

Q. State whether instances of that character were frequent in the State?

A. The instances have been very common.

Q. What are the means adopted to deny connection with this Order?

A. In the explanation given by the person initiating it was stated that the organization was known to the public as Ku-Klux, but that the proper name was White Brotherhood; and this difference was made so that when a person who was really a member of the White Brotherhood was put upon the witness stand and asked if he was a member of the Ku-Klux he could safely swear he was not.

Q. For what were the victims punished?

A. I do not know; just whatever they saw proper. If they thought the man ought to be killed for being too prominent in politics, they would have a meeting and pass sentence upon him. I have no doubt, though I have no information from others to that

effect, that Outlaw was killed to break up the organization of colored voters in my county or frighten them away from voting.

Q. Were other punishments ever inflicted in your county besides this?

A. Yes, sir. In consequence of Outlaw's murder a negro by the name of William Puryear, a half-simple fellow, who, it was said, saw some of his neighbors returning in disguise from Graham, the night Outlaw was hung, was drowned in the mill-pond.

Q. Were there any whippings in the county?

A. Yes, sir. I believe there were one hundred, or one hundred and fifty, in the last two years, white and black. Some have been whipped two or three times.

Q. Do you know when this organization first started in North Carolina?

A. No, sir. My first knowledge of it was during the Presidential canvass of 1868. I canvassed my county on the Seymour and Blair ticket, and went into the county of Randolph and made a speech at Liberty. There a gentleman from Guilford County, by the name of Higgins, came up to me and said, *that was his business*; and I, being a strong Democrat, and of course favorable to the cause, he had no delicacy in approaching me about it.

Q. Was the order made use of to advance the Democratic party?

A. O yes; undoubtedly.

Q. Was there any understanding that the organization in your county was connected with the State organization?

A. O yes, sir; that was understood, that it was connected not only throughout the State, but throughout the United States.

Q. Were those outrages, whippings, etc., more frequent after the organization started in your county?

A. We never had any before.

Q. The violence that took place, then, was not from individual and irresponsible men, but by order of the organization?

A. My impression is this: The organization did not remain in its original purity. I do not think, in many instances, they ever took the trouble to carry proceedings through the regular channels. They just gathered in neighborhoods in camp and agreed together to execute a decree; a member from another camp would come and tell his friends that there was such a person needed some attention, and they would go out and attend to his case. That was in order to prove an alibi. The man who was whipped or injured would generally suspect some person who lived in the neighborhood. That is the great reason that none of them have been caught or arrested.

Q. Was there any reference to the Constitution of the United States in any of the oaths?

A. In the Constitution Union Guards, not in the oath, but in the explanation of the object, it was stated to be the re-establishment of the Constitution as it was, without the amendments.

This must suffice as to the general character and purposes

of this organization ; but it should be understood that different witnesses presented it in different aspects. Another distinguished witness, David Schenck, Esq., a member of the bar of Lincoln County, who was initiated in Gascon County in October, 1868, and says he is ashamed of his connection with the order, represents it as a secret political association, on the basis of the Seymour and Blair platform, for furthering the success of the Democratic party. He does not think that there was any "uniformity of understanding about it, or that there was any connecting system between the different counties," and declares his belief that the original purpose was not improper. He says:

The obligation, as repeated to me, was simply a declaration of those principles which I openly espoused, and I honestly thought then, and do now, that the original purpose of those who initiated me was to promote party interests in a lawful way ; but it either became perverted, or they were mistaken in its objects, for it degenerated into a mob of rioters and marauders, who plundered and abused friend and foe alike.

Mr. Schenck says he soon became satisfied of the pernicious tendency and character of the Order, but that he was afraid to denounce it, and should have felt that his life was in danger if he had taken open ground against it.

As Mr. Schenck was called by the Democratic side of the Committee, and was evidently disposed to put as mild a face on the doings of the order as possible, there is one portion of his testimony which will be of great interest to the public every-where. He tells us that, notwithstanding the fearful state of society which this organization produced, it was effectually broken up by the Federal prosecutions, and that the Raleigh trials were fairly conducted ; that Judge Bond is an able lawyer, an upright man, and an excellent judge ; that the juries acted fairly and rendered just verdicts ; and that the defendants were properly punished. (Pages 389 and 394).

It will be remembered that, at the term of the United States Circuit Court, held at Raleigh, under what is known as the Ku-Klux Act, Judge Bond presided, and that true bills of indictment were found against seven hundred and sixty-three persons for offenses under that act. Of these, sixty were tried, and twenty-four convicted ; and there were twenty-three

who pleaded guilty, and thirteen who were acquitted. It was at these trials that Hon. Reverdy Johnson and Hon. Henry Stanbury appeared as counsel for the defendants, and that the former, in his surprise and indignation at the unexpected revelations, said :

I have listened with unmixed horror to some of the testimony which has been brought before you. The outrages *proved* are shocking to humanity ; they admit of neither excuse nor justification ; they violate every obligation which law and nature imposes upon men.

It is evident, as this witness testifies, that many of the proceedings were irregular, and without much regard to Klan authority. It is also probable that individuals and small parties of vicious persons, finding that their acts would be attributed to the Ku-Klux, took advantage of the unsettled state of society thus existing and committed outrages against obnoxious persons which were popularly regarded as the doings of the order. The whipping or shooting of a negro in such a state of society was of little account. Ex-Governor Parsons, of Alabama, says in his testimony : "I have never known an instance in which a man has been convicted of killing a negro."

Hence, if we would get a correct idea of the operations of this order we must follow it through the various States in its raids against persons of some standing and distinction. The testimony of individuals may be warped by the circumstances under which they act ; but if we find the same influences and the same machinery in widely sundered States, we may safely conclude that there is unity of organization and unity of purpose.

In North Carolina one of the most characteristic raids was that against James M. Justice. It shows that the organization was not confined to the county where he resided ; that it was under the direction of the better classes of society ; that it was admirable in its discipline, and totally regardless of the civil authorities. Mr. Justice is a native of the State, a lawyer of large practice, a member of the North Carolina House of Representatives, and had been canvassing his county against the proposed constitutional convention, which was a democratic measure. He had had no fear of personal danger, and in his speeches was severe against the Ku-Klux ; and had also been

counsel against some members who had been arrested and were held for trial.

His residence was in the village of Rutherfordton, where it was easy to give an alarm which could not fail to reach the ears of the surrounding shop-keepers and mechanics, and which might be expected to bring prompt and effective succor. But neither his position in society, nor his location in a village where he had many relatives and friends, was sufficient to save him from their clutches. On a Sunday night, about twelve o'clock, he was awakened out of a sound sleep by a violent crash at the front door, which was split or broken through with an ax. He knew what was coming, but no time was left him for action; for in a moment there was firing in all directions through the house, and his room was filled with armed men. A match was struck, and the light showed that they were in all sorts of disguises. "Some had very long white beards; some had horns which were erect; others had horns which lapped over like a mule's ears, and their caps ran up to a point, with tassels."

Two of them rushed forward to the bed and said, "You d—d rascal, come out," and they seized him and dragged him forward toward the door. He plead with them to let him alone, but they replied, "Don't say a word, your time has come." He then commenced screaming to raise an alarm, which was answered by a blow on the head with a pistol, which knocked him down, and which admonished him that it was best to keep silence.

On reaching the street he found that it was raining hard; and, as he was without shoes or stockings, or any clothing other than his night shirt, and his wound was bleeding badly, he began to suffer greatly and to feel faint. On reaching the outskirts of the village he complained that the gravel hurt his feet, and one of his attendants said in reply that "it would make no difference, he would not need his feet long." When his faintness overcame him and he asked to sit down, one of them charged him with "putting it on." He said no, his wound was bleeding and he was very weak. He was told in reply that "it was d—d nigger equality blood that was running out, and that it would do him good."

The party was large, but they had other work on hand, and

the larger portion broke off to destroy the office of the Republican paper, (the *Star*,) which was thoroughly broken up, but which Mr. Justice did not see done. After the division the smaller party, which had Mr. Justice in charge, became talkative, and asked him many questions, which he answered, and which he was able to answer, skillfully and well. On one occasion what they charged against him he shifted over on the government, and one of them said, "D—n such a government! that would put ignorant negroes over us to control white men. You have advocated this and you cannot deny it. You know a negro is not fit to rule over white men."

The conversation went on, and Mr. Justice had the idea that it was making an impression in his favor. We quote in his own words:

One said, "What kind of cases have you been having lately?" I said, "Almost all kinds—from murder down to assault and battery. We have been trying some cases against the Ku-Klux." "Yes," said he, "you are very fond of that kind of practice." I said "No, not especially so; but I was appointed by the commissioner to discharge a duty of that kind, and I have attempted to do it as I understand it to be right." "Yes," said he, "we know something about that; and you have been making some very strong speeches lately; you are in favor of hanging our leaders. Our party proposes to rid this country of this damned, infamous nigger government, and you propose to defeat us by hanging our leaders, you damned rascal; you are in favor of hanging leaders and letting the plow-boys go. Now, you are a leader on the other side, and what objection can you make to being hung, as you advocate the doctrine of hanging leaders." Well, I thought he was getting in on me pretty close, sure enough. I knew from that they had heard what I had said; but I replied that I had never advised anybody to do wrong, whether I was a leader or not. They said, "You have done some good things, which we appreciate; you had Carson discharged when he was wrongfully arrested."

The reply was that, although Mr. Justice had done some good things, he was working against them, and they were going to kill him. But the chief, who was in command of the party, and said he was from another county, seemed to lend a favorable ear to the conversation. He appeared to be much interested in finding a man by the name of Biggerstaff, who had been twice whipped, but who had escaped from a party just as they were about to hang him, and who, it would seem, was

under sentence of death. Mr. Justice had a long talk with this little chief, as he calls him, and the result was that the little chief announced his determination to save his life on the condition that he would meet him at an appointed place on the next Saturday night, and give information as to where Biggerstaff could be found, and that he would cease taking any further part in the canvass, and would pledge himself to be a true friend to the South. Mr. Justice says:

They were loud and clamorous in their protestations against letting me go, and declared that I must be killed. This chief man placed four men in a circle right around me and said, "Don't shoot here; you will shoot friends." He then talked with me again about Biggerstaff, and asked if I could not go and find him. Said he, "Our friends have had him twice, and he has promised us both times that he would not tell, and said that he did not know us, and both times he has gone right off, as soon as he could get to the officers, and sworn against us and brought us into trouble." And then he said to me, "Do you know that our camps have lately all been assembled, and that we have taken a fresh oath to the effect that we will kill every man who swears against us in the United States Courts?" I said that I did not know that. He said, "It is a matter of fact. Now Biggerstaff has testified so, not only once, but twice, and he has got some of our friends into a heap of trouble, and we will have to kill him. If he leaves this State and goes to another State, all we have to do is to send a decree to another camp there, and they will kill him. And you may as well show us where he is, so that we can kill him, for we are bound to kill him anyhow."

When the decree had gone forth to spare the life of Mr. Justice, the little chief, who, Mr. Justice says, was a very intelligent man, explained his action thus:

After the men had all gone out of sight, the chief said to me, "These fellows want to kill you very badly, but I want to save you if I can. I have an absolute order to take your life to-night. But I will tell you something about our rules. We may be ordered to go and whip a man, to give him a certain number of lashes, and he may behave in such a way as to justify our taking his life. Then we may be ordered to take a man's life, but if he behaves so as to justify us we may spare him. I think you ought to be spared, and I want to do it, and I will do it if I can control these men, though they seem to be very ambitious toward you, and I think entirely too much so. You know most of these men, I think, if you could see their faces, for they are men you are acquainted with. But you don't know me; you never saw me until to-night; I have heard of you, and my friends know you well. I think from the talk I have had with you to-night that they are

mistaken about you. If you will stop supporting the damned radical party I think you will be all right, and I should like to know you in our order."

Mr. Justice the next day received an order to go to Washington to give testimony before the committee, and so failed to keep his appointment with the chief. Mr. Justice thinks that there have been more than a hundred raids in his county, and at each raid a number of outrages, mostly whippings, but some murders; and he mentions the burning of two colored school-houses and one colored church.

In South Carolina one of the witnesses, William K. Owens, gives the particulars of his initiation into the Order in 1870, and discloses what was the oath, the signs, the pass-words, etc. He says that the members were bound to obey all the orders of their chief, and that if murder was decreed, the penalty of any disobedience was death; that they were to deny their membership, and to clear each other as jurors or as witnesses; that the Order has an existence in all parts of the State; that he has recognized members in several different counties, and in North Carolina; that several murders were committed in York, where he resided, and that he was on a raid to arrest and murder the treasurer of the county, who, however, escaped; he gives the names of the chiefs and members in the town of York, and states that it was a part of their business to disarm negroes; that the object was political, "to carry the negro for the democratic party."

The effect which the operations of the Order had on political affairs may be inferred from what took place in the county of Spartanburg, where the Democratic county paper published forty-five renunciations like the following:

MR. EDITOR: I desire to make this public announcement of my withdrawal from all affiliation with the Republican party, with which I have heretofore acted. I am prompted to take this step from the conviction that the policy of said party, in encouraging fraud, bribery, and excessive taxation, is calculated to ruin the country.

One of these notices, signed by Samuel T. White, has a little history connected with it which will explain the appearance of the others. He was before the Committee, is a respectable white man, a carpenter, forty-four years of age, and a native of the county. At night, when he was asleep in his house, he was

awakened by a crowd, who were clamoring to have the door opened. He says:

After I got up the light I walked to the front door and opened it, and the men there hallooed to the others at the back door to stop lamming, and they stopped. They then ordered me to cross my hands; I did so. They asked for a rope; I told them there was none. I reckon one of them went up the stairs with a light to get a piece of rope—an old bed-cord or something, and they took a pillow-slip and slipped it over my head and led me into the yard. They asked me my principles, and I told them. They said, "That was what I thought you were."

They asked if I was a Union man or a Democrat. I told them I had always been a Union man. They said they thought so. They carried me off seventy-five or eighty yards from the house. They said, "Here is a limb," and they asked me whether I would rather be shot, hung, or whipped. I told them if it had to be one, I would have to take a whipping. They ordered me to run; I told them I did not wish to do that. Then they commenced on me.

Question. What did they do?

Answer. They whipped me.

Q. How?

A. They took little hickories and one thing or another.

Q. Was the whipping a severe one?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many men were there?

A. I can't say as to that; I thought, from the number around the house, there were twenty or thirty.

Q. How were they dressed?

A. They were disguised.

Q. How were they disguised?

A. With horns and every thing over their faces.

Q. Could you tell who any of them were?

A. No, sir.

Q. What was done after they were through whipping you?

A. They just untied my hands, got on their horses, and went out.

Q. Did they leave you there?

A. Yes, sir. They told me I must publish my principles.

Q. Would you have published any card of this kind if these men had not required it?

A. No, sir.

Some of the other parties were examined to the same effect, and in one case the requirement was still more humiliating. Mr. John Genobles, a white man, sixty-nine years of age, who had been in the county over forty years, after being dragged from his bed and severely beaten with hickories, was let off

from further punishment on a promise that he would go to the court-house steps and publicly declare himself to be a Democrat, and if he failed to do it he was to be killed. Of course, after such a warning, he fulfilled his promise.

Dr. John Winsmith was a native of Spartanburg, and had resided there since his birth, sixty-eight years. He was a planter and a practicing physician, and was for fifteen years a member of the State Legislature. He is a man of high character and of large acquaintance; but he made up his mind to vote for Governor Scott, and it was reported, as he says, falsely, that he had procured arms and put them into the hands of his negroes. Nothing had occurred to awaken any suspicions on his part, and when he was aroused in the night (March 22, 1871) by strange noises about his yard, he got up and went to the back door, and saw two men, who immediately called out to another portion of the party who were at the front door, "Come around here, boys, here's the d—d rascal!" The doctor then suspected the facts, and, having a couple of pistols where he could lay his hands on them, he fell back for a moment and then reappeared and fired. The men ran, and he followed them around to the front, when he heard noises which indicated a large company. He was met by a volley of balls, and was struck in seven different places; but he used his pistols with so much effect that they fled. He sank down in the yard faint and exhausted with the loss of blood, and for some time his life was despaired of; but he ultimately recovered. They were disguised, and were about thirty in number.

William M. Champion, another Spartanburg man who was whipped a hundred lashes, when asked what it was done for said, all he could hear was that he "was a d—d old radical son of a b—h." When asked what was the effect of these doings on society, he said: "It has thrown us into the woods at night, and we are afraid to be out in the day-time. I have never laid in my bed from the time I was whipped till now."

The awful condition of such a society cannot well be imagined. Hundreds of people slept in the woods for months together, and a feeling of alarm seized all classes of persons, but was general among the negroes. A list was exhibited to the Committee in the examination of P. Q. Camp, Esq., and Rev. Dr. Cummings, particularizing two hundred and twenty-seven

cases of outrage, one hundred and eighteen being in one township, and four of them resulting in death. But the Deputy United States Marshal, C. L. Casy, Esq., says that the list does not cover half the cases, and that the whippings must have reached nearly five hundred. The apprehension was so general that many houses were entirely deserted at night, and the women and children took their blankets and repaired regularly to the woods. In his testimony he says:

A good many in the country told me they were sleeping out, and afraid to stay at home; and I know of men in the lower portion of the county sleeping out that have not slept in their houses since the election last November—in fact, the times have been so here in town that about six or eight of us could not stay at our own houses. We had to club together and lie out every night, first at one place and then at another.

In Union County the county officers all had notices from the Ku-Klux that they must resign, and, understanding too well what would be the result if they did not comply, they sent in their resignations. Of course the state of things was not so bad in all the counties, and hence it was that when the President issued his proclamation, in 1871, suspending the privileges of the writ, he only included the counties which were most infested by these devils in disguise. At the subsequent term of the Circuit Court held under the Ku-Klux Act at Columbus, there were seven hundred and eighty-five indictments. About fifty pleaded guilty, and five were convicted on trial. The Grand Jury in their presentation say:—"They have been as much appalled by the number of outrages as at their character, it appearing that eleven murders and over six hundred whippings have been committed in York County alone."

Among the Ku-Klux cases in Alabama there is one which shows how, in some cases, they completely overawed and controlled the courts. In the county of Greene a man named Snoddy had been killed, and three negroes were arrested and thrown into prison, on a charge of having committed the murder. One of them, by the name of Colvin, was, on the preliminary examination, discharged; and he was soon after visited by a band of disguised men and put to death. Alexander Boyd, the prosecuting attorney, whose duty it was to bring the murderers of Colvin to an account, undertook the work, and said he knew the persons who had hung Colvin, and intended

to keep the jury in session six months but he would get them indicted.

He was a single man, and had his home at the hotel on the public square at Eutaw, a village of two thousand inhabitants, and was apparently safe from any danger of a midnight attack. But about eleven o'clock at night, on the 31st of March, 1870, a band of twenty-five disguised men rode into the town, formed in front of the hotel, and then sent a deputation from their number inside to compel the clerk to show them to the room of Mr. Boyd; and, having found their victim, they put two balls through his head, and left him deliberately, assured that there would be no danger of prosecutions henceforth from that quarter. Of course courts and court officers drew the inference that it was rather a dangerous thing to interfere with the Ku-Klux, and became increasingly cautious. Boyd was buried the next day. No arrests were made, no meeting of the bar was called, and not a member attended his funeral. At the next term of the court the Grand Jury reported that they were unable to identify any body connected with the murder, but that the party was traced on their way home to Pickens County.

There is another aspect in which these Ku-Klux operations present themselves, and which was particularly noticeable in Alabama. We refer to their interference in matters of education and religion. From the testimony of Mr. Speed, a regent of the Alabama State University, it appears that the Faculty of that institution was not to the liking of the order, and that they determined to break it up. Mr. Speed is a Southern man, and went to Tuscaloosa to take part in reorganizing the University. While there he was handed a number of Ku-Klux notices to the students, which were hung on a dagger, and the dagger stuck in one of the doors of the University. The following is a copy of one of these notices, directed to a student by the name of Harton. It was signed, "By order of the K. K. K.:"

HARTON: They say you are of good Democratic family. If you are, leave the University, and that quick. We don't intend that the concern shall run any longer. This is the second notice you have received; you will get no other. In less than ten days we intend to clean out the concern. We *will* have good Southern men there or none.

The students thus notified were alarmed, and within the time named left for their homes. One of the reasons for this hostility toward the University was, probably, the election, in 1868, of the Rev. A. S. Lakin as its president, who held his relation to the Methodist Episcopal Church, as contradistinguished from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and was therefore an offense to the old Southern master-race. Mr. Lakin was sent South by the authorities of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to organize Churches in its interest, and, beginning his work in the latter part of 1865, had been wonderfully successful. The loyal element naturally gravitated toward him, and the Churches which he formed consequently became the particular object of Ku-Klux hatred. Mr. Lakin, in his testimony, shows some of the obstacles which he and his devoted band of ministers were called to encounter.

Rev. Mr. Sullivan was severely whipped, and while they were inflicting their punishment they warned him that they were bound to kill his Presiding Elder, Mr. Lakin, and that he must preach for the Methodist Church, South, as they were determined that there should be no Methodist Church south of Mason's and Dixon's line but the Church South. Rev. J. A. McCutchen, Presiding Elder, was driven from the Demopolis District in 1868. Rev. James Buchanan was driven from his station. Rev. John W. Tailly, Presiding Elder, was also driven away. Rev. Jesse Kingston was shot. Rev. Mr. Johnson was shot in his pulpit. Rev. James Dorman was whipped in 1869, and driven away in 1870. Rev. Mr. Dean was whipped, and left for dead, having had both of his arms broken. Rev. George Taylor was whipped. And a colored preacher and his son were murdered.

He tells us that in his district six churches were burned by incendiaries, four of them within six weeks of the election, (1870), and that a great many school-houses suffered the same fate. He kept a memorandum of the outrages committed in his district, and his notes include thirty-five murders and three hundred and seventy-one whippings.

In Mississippi the schools were even more the subject of Ku-Klux attention than in Alabama. In Pontotoc County, where the white population largely predominate, there were fifty-two white and twelve colored schools, and the teachers of both

were mostly from the South, and only about one tenth of them were Republicans; but in April, 1871, the teachers of the colored schools were generally called on by the Ku-Klux, and warned that if they did not stop teaching they would be dealt with. One of them disregarded the call and received a second warning, and was generally believed to have been whipped; but whether this was so or not, he abandoned his school.

The breaking up of these schools was not on account of the political predilections of the teachers, for it was ascertained that all but one were Democrats. Col. Flourney, the superintendent, was called on by the Ku-Klux, but was warned of his danger and met them with arms, and one of them was mortally wounded.

Col. A. P. Huggins had been an officer in the Union army, and went into Mississippi to reside in 1865. He at first rented a plantation in Monroe County, which he cultivated till 1867, when he became an officer of the Freedman's Bureau and removed to Jackson. In 1869 he went back to Monroe, and was appointed Assistant Assessor of Internal Revenue; and the next year was made County Superintendent of Schools.

On the 8th of March (1870) he went into the country some eight or ten miles from Aberdeen, the county town, and was engaged during the day in visiting schools, and on the following day, after attending to his duties as assessor and visiting more schools, he went by invitation to spend the night with a Mr. Ross. That night Mr. Huggins was called on in a very civil way by a well-disciplined company of Ku-Klux, numbering one hundred and twenty persons; and he and Mr. Ross, at the bidding of a deputation, went out into the yard to answer the summons of the chief. What then occurred we leave him to tell in his own words:

When I got down to the fence I asked the chief if he would now state my little bit of warning. He said the decree of the camp was that I should leave the county and State in ten days. He told me that the rule of the camp was, 1. To give the warning; 2. To enforce obedience to their laws by whipping; 3. To kill by the Klan; 4. If that was not done, and obedience was still refused, to kill privately by assassination or otherwise. They said that I was collecting obnoxious taxes from Southern gentlemen to keep d—d old radicals in office; that they wanted me to understand that no laws should be enforced there that they did not make themselves; that they did not like my general radical

ways. I asked them if their operations were against the radical party; they said they were; that they had suffered and endured the radical sway as long as they could; that the radicals had oppressed them with taxation; that they were oppressing them all the time, and that I was the instrument of collecting the taxes; that they had stood it just as long as they could, and that this was their way of getting rid of it; that they were bound to rid themselves of radicals, if it took the killing of them, or something to that effect. There was a colored school and a white school in the neighborhood. I knew most of the men there were from that neighborhood; I asked them with reference to Mr. Davis's school; that was the white school, where I supposed the most of their children were attending; I asked them if they were not satisfied with his school. They said, "No;" that they liked Davis well enough as a teacher, but that they were opposed to the free-school system entirely; that the whites could do as they had always done before; that they could educate their own children; that so far as the negroes were concerned they did not need educating, only to work. They said they had no objection to Davis at all, but that they could manage their own affairs without the State or the United States sending such as I was there to educate their children, and at the same time to educate the negroes too. After the conversation on the school subject closed, one of them said, "Well, sir, what do you say to our warning? Will you leave?" I told them I should leave Monroe County at my pleasure, and not untill I got ready. The captain then said to me, "Sir, you say you will not leave; you will not obey our warning?" I said I would not obey; that I would leave when I got ready, and not before; that I would not be driven from any place. The gate was then thrown open, and the fence was climbed by twenty men in a moment. I was surrounded and disarmed; the pistol that I had had until that time was taken away. They then took me between an eighth and a quarter of a mile down the road, and came to a hill, where they stopped; they then asked me if I was still of the same opinion—that I would not leave the county; I told them I was; that I would not leave. They said they should hate very much to interfere with me; that they had made promises to Mr. Ross and myself; that I had really not been obnoxious to them only in the tax line, and that they would not like to interfere with me, for they counted me as a gentleman; that all they wanted was to get rid of me from the county and from the State; that I could not stay there. They said that if I would promise them, I should go back to my bed and sleep quietly, and they would all go on home; they really urged in every way that it was possible for men to do to get me to promise to leave the county and the State without any violence. They then showed me a rope with a noose, and said that was for such as myself who were stubborn; that if I did not consent to leave I should die; that dead men tell no tales. At this time I saw a man coming from toward the horses; he had a stirrup-strap some inch and a quarter in width, and at least an

eighth of an inch thick; it was very stout leather; the stirrup was a wooden one. As he came up he threw down the wooden stirrup and came on toward me, and I saw that he was intending to hit me with the strap; that that was the weapon they intended to use first. He came on, and without further ceremony at all—I was in my shirt-sleeves—he struck me two blows, calling out, “One, two,” and said, “Now, boys, count.” They counted every lash they gave me. The first man gave me ten blows himself, standing on my left side, striking over my left arm and on my back; the next one gave me five blows. Then a fresh hand took it and gave me ten blows; that made twenty-five. They then stopped, and asked me again if I would leave the county. I still refused, and told them that now they had commenced they could go just as far as they pleased; that all had been done that I cared for; that I would as soon die then as to take what I had taken. They continued to strike their blows on my back in the same way until they had reached fifty. None of them struck more than ten blows, some of them only three, and some as low as two. They said they all wanted to get a chance at me; that I was stubborn and just such a man as they liked to pound. When they had struck me fifty blows they stopped again and asked me if I would leave; I told them I would not. Then one of the strongest and most burly in the crowd took the strap himself and gave me twenty-five blows without stopping; that made seventy-five; I heard them say, “Seventy-five.” At that time my strength gave way entirely; I grew dizzy and cold; I asked for my coat; that is the last I remember for several minutes. When I recovered myself they were still about me; I was standing; I do not think I had been down; they must have held me up all the time. I heard them say, “He is not dead yet; dead men tell no tales.” But still they all seemed disposed, as I thought, to let me go; I heard no threatening, except what passed a few moments afterward. They passed in front of me, and drew their pistols and showed them to me; they told me that if I was not gone within ten days they were all sworn in their camp, and sworn positively, that they would kill me, either privately or publicly.

With that warning they left him with Mr. Ross, on whose advice he went into the gin-house to await the light of the coming day, fearing there might be a return, and he ultimately made his way back to Aberdeen without further molestation.

In April two of the board of school directors who had voted for the school tax were warned to resign and complied without hesitation. About the same time all the teachers on the east side of the river (Tombigbee) were notified to close their schools, and twenty-six schools were immediately suspended. The warnings were given in a body at night, and among the warned was Miss Sarah A. Allen, a lady sent by a missionary society

from Geneseo, Illinois. Eighty Ku-Klux visited her in a body at twelve o'clock at night, calling her from her bed and ordering her to close her school on Wednesday, which she did. Mr. Huggins says, "She is a highly educated and accomplished young lady."

But the space prescribed for this article will not allow further details. There are thirteen volumes of testimony full of just such statements, and indicating a condition of society not to be paralleled in any civilized country. But the acts set forth need no illustration. They speak for themselves. What we have aimed at is to deal with the better class of these raids in which some ceremony is always observed, and which are free from much of the coarseness and vulgarity which characterize the assaults on low persons; and we have taken them from different States, and from points widely separated, in order to show that there must have been unity of design and purpose; and that where the spirit and action were so manifestly alike, it must have been produced by organization springing from the same source.

Happily the prompt measures of the President, taken under the Ku-Klux Act and embracing the numerous arrests, to which some reference has been made, and the trial and conviction of many of the guilty persons engaged in these raids, has pretty much put an end to them; while the exposure of individual members, and the obvious tendency of their acts, has produced such a wholesome influence on Southern society as will probably prevent any general recurrence of these monstrous crimes.

ART. V.—YOUNG ROUMANIA.

DURING the last few years public attention has been so frequently attracted to events transpiring within the domain of those principalities of the Lower Danube that have lately assumed the high-sounding title of Roumania, that we think a few pages devoted to the discussion of the past history, present condition, and future prospects of this new nationality may not be unacceptable.

As regards the past we shall be very brief, in view of the deep interest attaching to its present deeds and *status*. The

three provinces of Wallachia and that of Moldavia, extending along the left bank of the Danube from the Hungarian frontier to the Black Sea and the Russian boundary, claim to be the principal seat of ancient Dacia, a province founded by the Romans under Trajan, after a long and desperate conflict with the native tribes. The Romans held the region until the reign of Aurelianus, when they were gradually conquered or driven away by the inroads of the Goths, Vandals, and other Germanic tribes.

The Roman influence, however, remained, and, through varying fortunes in numerous conflicts, seems in some portion of the territory to have held its own against the aggressions of Greeks and Turks in many and bitter strifes. In certain portions of Wallachia a corruption of the Roman tongue has been preserved, and the people assume to speak the Latin as a living language. But it is so corrupted and debased by being long commingled with native idioms, that it amounts to a figure of speech to call it Latin. But the people cling with ludicrous tenacity to the legends of their early history, and, therefore, when, a few years ago, they succeeded in so far breaking away from the trammels of the surrounding nations as to found a separate nationality, they gave to it the name of Roumania, in view of their descent from ancient Rome.

This, however, has proved a very unfortunate whim, for it has placed them in continual antagonism with themselves and their neighbors, and induced them to strive after and imitate a grade of civilization of which they in reality have no conception. They are surrounded by nationalities so various in character, and so widely different in tendencies, that under the most favorable circumstances they would find themselves in direct contrast with some of them; but by their endeavor to clothe a totally undeveloped people with all the paraphernalia of a high degree of civilization, they only succeed in producing the grossest incongruities.

For many years these provinces have held a peculiar relation to the Sublime Porte, which has given them a sort of protectorate, while it has made them at the same time tributary. This state of things has, perhaps, insured their existence, for the jealousy of the Great Powers in regard to any thing to which Turkey might lay a claim has alone prevented Rou-

mania from being swallowed up by Hungary, Austria, or Russia, which countries are ever looking with longing eyes toward these rich valleys in the hope of some day possessing them.

The Treaty of Paris, after the war of the Crimea, fixed the *status* of Roumania toward Turkey and the Great Powers in a way to assist in the formation of the new nation which Europe seemed to desire as a barrier between the Occident and the Orient. The principalities were to continue to be under the protectorate of the Porte, and the guarantee of the contracting powers, for the enjoyment of all the immunities and privileges of which they were then in possession; but these were very illy defined. And it was further stipulated that these principalities might govern themselves, and without any co-operation or interference of the Porte, within the limits agreed on by the Great Powers and the Turkish government. And thus the whole matter was diplomatically left in so confused and indistinct a state that neither the Great Powers, the Porte, nor the principalities themselves, knew how they stood toward each other.

This seemed to be an opportunity granted to these provinces to see what they could do for themselves. If they could be successful in the experiment of self-government, Europe would be glad to see them succeed, and thus put an end to the vexed question as to what was best to do with the territory lying along the Danube between Hungary and the sea. This was, of course, not agreeable to Turkey, who would like to continue in force the sovereignty still claimed, but of late yielded with a passably good grace, though not by any means relinquished.

For a long series of years the principalities had been governed by native princes under the sovereignty of Turkey. Their rule, however, had been one continued history of intrigues and family strife, ending in revolt or assassination. When, in 1866, the last native prince, Cousa, followed the fate of his predecessors, it was thought best to give up the effort to get along with native rulers, and, with the consent of the Sultan and the Great Powers, Prince Charles of Hohenzollern was called to govern the United Principalities of the Danube. On the occasion of the marriage of this prince, in his auto-

graph letter to the Sultan, he for the first time used the official title of Roumania.

The poor prince virtually accepted a crown of thorns. Roumania, as he took it, was bad enough; but Young Roumania, as it has since developed itself, and whose story we shall mainly tell, is as wayward, self-willed, selfish, and ungovernable a child as ever entered the family of nations. Prince Charles has scarcely spent a happy, quiet hour since he went there, and again and again he has threatened to throw up his charge and leave. He has only been deterred from so doing by an ardent and honest desire to benefit the people over whom he is called to rule, and by the earnest entreaties of the more sensible and thoughtful among the Roumanians, who would see in his departure an end to all their hopes regarding self-government.

The crazy fantasy has taken possession of the young men especially that they are to be the modern Romans, and must look to their supposed ancestors for their political teachings. In this they have been taught by a certain Professor Barmetz, of the Juristic Faculty of Bucharest, the capital, and now deceased. For several years he lectured on the common law of Roumania, and his lectures, left in manuscript, have since been published, and the book is heralded by his pupils as the gospel of the new birth of Roumania. His principal postulates are that ancient Roman law has continued to live in spirit in the traditions of the Dacians, and that it is only necessary to revive this code to attain to ancient Roman greatness. All questions are to be solved in this sense, beginning with the old agrarian laws, according to which two thirds of their possessions must be taken from wealthy landholders and distributed among the people, so that every Roumanian may become a landholder.

With a view to revive national trade and industry, foreign competition must be destroyed; and this is to be effected by driving all strangers from the country, especially the Jews and the Germans. This doctrine also leads, of course, to opposition to a foreign prince, and those who preach it insist that every foreign dynasty must therefore be null and void. These radicals adopt the French cognomen of the "Reds," and, by the aid of the moderate liberals or fractionists, occasionally come

into power; but whether in or out, they are ever causing a world of trouble, as the frequent diplomatic notes regarding affairs in Roumania fully attest.

It is of little use to prove that these assertions of Barmetz are all without foundation, and that the Romans practically never did any such thing; these radicals think they ought to have done so, and this satisfies them as to the doctrine.

As to the presence of foreigners in Roumania, it may be an evil, but it is one very necessary to its existence. The Roumanians, as a people, are singularly lacking in industry and knowledge. They may be divided into two classes: the Boyars, or nobles, who are too proud to do any thing, and the peasants, who scarcely know enough to till the soil successfully. Manufactures, trade, and commerce must therefore be in the hands of strangers, or cease to exist and the State must perish. For centuries the Germans have represented the industrial interests, and the Jews have carried on the trade of the country. The schools owe their idea, their culture, and their teachers to France and Germany. The only way to dispense with these parties is to raise up native substitutes to take their places, and to expel them by being more industrious, more active, and more intelligent than they. So long as this is not the case the persecution of foreigners, as such, is simply a piece of barbarism and inconsistency.

Roumania is indeed a land of inconsistencies and harsh contrasts. In appearance it is neither oriental nor occidental, but partakes to a certain extent of both these qualities. The two grades of civilization mingle, but do not assimilate. The Boyar nobles are ever striving to imitate the luxury and the manners of Western Europe, while the peasants conservatively cling to their old semi-oriental ways. European culture is maintained and developed mainly by the classes that are ill-treated, namely, the Germans and the Jews. In the Carpathian mountains timber is so abundant that the owners cannot obtain remuneration for simply cutting it, while in the neighboring cities fuel is so dear that the poor can scarcely obtain enough for the necessities of life.

The soil is very rich, and the plains are capable of becoming the granaries of surrounding nations. But over vast regions the agricultural processes are so primitive that the produc-

tion is very limited; and then again, as if to keep up the contrast, one finds model farms where all the appliances of the best English and American implements are brought into use. These same sharp contrasts are met in the cities themselves. Bucharest is noted for them. The fashionable avenue of the capital resembles that of some of the larger cities of Europe; the stores make brilliant displays, and elegant equipages roll by containing aristocratic ladies adorned in princely style. A few rods aside from these, in either direction, one meets open lots covered with rude cabins and reeking with filth, and streets peopled with naked children, lounging men, and smoking women. The only industrials to be seen are the gypsies, with their portable forges, plying their customary occupations.

Civilization seems to have been sprung upon the Roumanians while a large portion of the population are not ready for it, and it sits with no grace on any but the wealthy Boyars, who spend years in Paris and other European capitals and bring back with them their luxurious habits acquired abroad. It were far better for the country had the change been gradual, so that all classes might have grown into it and assimilated with it. There are some good schools and hospitals, but they are sustained and controlled by a few energetic persons for the benefit of a very small fraction of the upper classes. And if these are chided for neglecting the masses below them, they invariably answer that the poorer classes are so deficient in capacity and development that it would be labor lost to endeavor to extend these advantages to them.

The Greek Church is greatly at fault for the low moral and religious condition of the people. The priests are perfectly satisfied with the external observance of the old ritual laws and ceremonies, and spare their subjects any onerous submission to internal convictions. The most incongruous materials will assemble for their religious observances, varying in nationality and belief, or with no belief at all.

Recent laws have abolished all caste distinctions, and still these practically exist all over Roumania. As there is really no native middle class, the chasm between the peasantry, even those who have lately become landholders, and the Boyar nobles, is practically impassable. The Constitution is very generous, with

rights and privileges for the sovereign people; but these latter are totally unacquainted with the simplest forms of parliamentary life, and are thus excluded from a share in the government. The people still believe in what they have learned by tradition, and have little desire to pass beyond the patriarchal form of government. Civil matters are, therefore, entirely in the hands of the heavy landed proprietors, lawyers, professors of the schools, and the literary men generally. These take the greatest interest in the elections, and compose the great majority of the members of their legislative body. About a dozen influential families think themselves born to the people, and are not slow to claim it; and of course those ruling houses, whose access to power is cut off by the fact that a foreign prince is on the throne, are ever ready to find fault about every political mishap that occurs.

This dissatisfaction has given impetus to the growth of the Young Roumanians, who date their birth from the revolutionary period of 1848. It was at this time that arose the cry for nationality in the midst of revolutions, and the example of the Hungarians was not to be lost on the inhabitants of the various provinces of the Lower Danube, who claimed a common origin. As we know, this enthusiasm was followed by no practical effect, for Russian intervention assisted the Austrian authorities in quelling every uprising in this sense. But, though the men were conquered, the spirit lives, and it has gradually grown with the present generation. It has been nurtured in the German fashion by the teachers and students of the higher schools, until it has run into a species of political enthusiasm in which men's theories have got the better of their brains. The Wallachians began to study their Latin origin, and permitted their fancy to find roots with the Latin people that most probably never existed. In this vagary they were not a little assisted by the notions of Louis Napoleon, who fancied himself sent to restore the Latin races on both continents to the power once held by their ancestors.

This was the origin of the modern cry of Pan-Latinism, which so pleased the fancy of the Wallachians that they were ready to run into any extreme which might seem calculated to further their notions. The more radical any political measure, the more sure it was to find favor with the Pan-Latinists, or

Young Roumanians. If they attain the power, the order of the day will be continual friction with all the neighboring States, and continual strife with every nationality in their midst that cannot trace its origin, as do they, to Latin roots. This radical party seems to delight in turmoil and destruction, and chooses to call itself "Red," in imitation of its French exemplars, who are the more acceptable to it because they also boast of their Latinism and declare enmity to other races, and most especially to the Teutonic and Saxon.

Their organ is the "Romanul," an incendiary sheet, whose pleasure seems to be to sow discord within and suspicion toward all foreign powers, whom it accuses of buying up every ministry that comes into power. These agitators present a splendid programme for the future, and thus tickle the fancy of a people who have not much to look to in the past. In this way they obtain a certain popularity which brings many to their ranks through fear of them, and not unfrequently gives them the balance of power. The result of this turmoil and unrest is seen in the continual change of the ministry, which makes a systematic and consistent administration impossible, and prevents the country from making any real progress in political life. These parties are ever working against the ministry, and endeavoring to overthrow it by a vote of want of confidence; for, although the Roumanian Constitution does not require it, tradition at Bucharest demands the retirement of a ministry under such circumstances. And with the ministers fall all the officers of the civil service, even to those in the post-office and telegraph departments, to say nothing of the entire judiciary and fiscal service. All these vacated places are filled with new and inexperienced men, simply because they are adherents of the new ministry.

The government starts again with a majority in Chambers, and with the determination, perhaps, to make great sacrifices to keep it. But the opposition grows at the passage of every measure that happens to displease some one, and the irrecconcilables feed the flame of discord until the Chambers are again found in the opposition. Thus no Roumanian is sure of the morrow, and not a few, therefore, are constitutionally timid and hesitating. This condition of things is most deleterious to any true progress, and must be abolished before

any thing good can be expected for the land. Nothing can be accomplished in Roumania until the government resolves to stand firm against the slander of cliques and the outcry of unprincipled journals. This effort Prince Charles has just endeavored to make by insisting on retaining a ministry notwithstanding the passage of an unfavorable vote by a small majority. It remains to be seen whether the malcontents can harass him enough to induce him to give up his purpose.

One means of doing this is by getting up some civil disturbance that will involve his government with other powers—either Turkey, that still claims a certain control, or the Great Powers, that guarantee its existence. The easiest method to effect this, and at the same time to gratify an envious and cruel spirit, is to start the periodical raids against the Jews, or make an attack on the Germans. These have now become so common and so notorious that the attention of the civilized world has been drawn to them, and we think it well to dwell a little on the motives to these outrages.

In earlier times, while Roumania was still under Turkish oppression, many Polish and Russian Jews fled from persecution in their native country and sought a home in Moldavia and Wallachia. In these provinces they found their opportunity in the fact that there was no middle class between the noble and the peasant, and thus the way was open to them to engage in industrial pursuits and the various branches of trade. In this way they soon made themselves useful if not indispensable to the country. When Roumania became independent, and adopted a liberal constitution, the Jews and the Germans came in greater numbers, under the guarantee of personal rights, and established in Bucharest and Jassy various industrial schools in which native children were taught the most necessary trades; but a certain indolence of disposition has prevented them from competing with the frugal and economical Jews and Germans, whom they now regard as obstacles in their way, and therefore heartily hate.

As the Jews became wealthy an effort was made to profit of their means. Some of their liberties were restricted, and oppressive laws were enacted against them. They were not allowed to own houses in the principal streets of Bucharest,

not even to hire them for trading purposes; and still those who followed no occupation, unless they had certain possessions, were condemned as vagabonds and sent over the frontier. They were also forbidden to keep houses of public entertainment in cities and villages. But these laws were never put in force against them, because the Boyars owned the houses and needed the high rents that they could press out of the Jews if the laws were disregarded. They were again made liable to military duty; but this turned out to be only with a view to extort from them large sums to buy themselves free.

Notwithstanding all these oppressions, the Jews have flourished and acquired fortunes; some of the largest banking and commercial houses in the large cities of Roumania belong to them, and half the nobles in the country are in debt to them. Thus they become obnoxious to both classes; the Boyars hate them on account of the annual call for interest on mortgaged estates, and the peasants do the same because they are unpleasant competitors in all the ordinary pursuits of wealth. These animosities have frequently broken out into cruel persecutions, which have darkened the history of these provinces for a long course of years. In the beginning of the last century one of the hospodars of Moldavia led off in a persecution of the Jews which ended in the destruction of their temple, and they bought the permission to reconstruct it only with large sums of money.

The year 1814 is notorious in this connection on account of an attack which did not end in the destruction of their place of worship, but extended to their houses, which were terribly plundered, while about one hundred and thirty of the victims were killed. Similar bloody scenes were enacted in some of the towns immediately after the Crimean war, and a few years ago the capital, Bucharest, was disgraced by an attack on the new and beautiful synagogue. For some years the reports concerning violent excesses against the Jews have been periodical, the excitement regarding one scarcely dying away before we hear of another, and these have in large measure been stimulated by hostile measures of the government, although the authorities take good care to make a great show of indignation over the very outrages which they are largely responsible in instigating.

Old ordinances against the Jews are allowed to remain as dead letters for years because their execution would be contrary to the interests of the wealthy classes. In the meanwhile the peasants become uneasy and restless about the oppression of the nobles, and, to satisfy the former with some sort of revenge, they are stirred up to believe that the Jews and the foreigners, especially the Germans, are the cause of all their troubles, and are induced to believe that until these classes are expelled they can never expect real prosperity. Now it is a dangerous thing to attack the Germans, for they have consuls at their back to protect them, and of late years strong governments to protect the consuls. There is, therefore, nothing left on which the peasants may safely vent their spite but the poor Jews, who have no nationality as such, and accordingly the raid is as usual turned against them. And this is always easily effected under the cry that it is necessary to protect the unsophisticated peasant against the cunning and overreaching Jew.

But what is most remarkable about the case is the fact that these persecutions are mostly set in motion by the leaders of the liberal party—the Young Roumanians. Even Prime Minister Bratiano, while holding his short lease of power, did not hesitate to oppose the removal of Jewish disabilities in his zeal for what he and his followers call the national element. He was ready to acknowledge that the despised and ill-treated Jew had performed a most important part in the regeneration of the material interests of the country, but the Jew had had his day, and must be dismissed.

These "Reds," as they delight to call themselves in imitation of their French exemplars, frequently find a means of annoying the government party, and of involving it with protecting Turkey and the Great Powers by getting up a raid against the Jews. These cruelties exasperate the world to such an extent that Christendom cries out against it; the powers appeal to Turkey to put an end to them; Turkey threatens to interfere with her troops if the outrages do not cease; the home government explains and apologizes, and shows its weakness and actual inability to control these matters; when, finally, the ministry will be so embarrassed that a vote of want of confidence is gotten through the Chambers, and the ministry gives

way for a new set. This confusion was just what the "Reds" wanted, and they gain their point.

In all the provinces under the protectorate of Turkey the European consuls have almost unlimited power over the subjects of their respective governments. If foreigners in these lands violate the local laws they are sent for trial to their own consuls, and not to Turkish or local authorities. But this provision is nearly always violated in regard to the Jews, unless these latter are wealthy and influential from their European connections, mercantile or otherwise. These poor wretches are therefore always given over to the tender mercies of their worst enemies, and the only protection they obtain is from the protest of the consuls of their home government, which occasionally effects release from punishment after the greatest part of their undeserved infliction has expired.

The prejudice against the Jews in Roumania is increased by the fact that the largest part of them are Germans. This heaps against them in the mind of the Young Roumanians the double charge of adverse nationality and despised religion. As bigoted Latinists and enthusiastic admirers of the French radicals, the Roumanians have every reason to hate and attack these unwelcome guests, and it is no easy matter for the German powers to protect their subjects in a diplomatic way on account of the numberless subterfuges and apologies that rise to the surface when matters assume a serious aspect. To interfere with military force would so complicate affairs while a German prince is on the throne that it must be reserved as a last resort, for the first move on the part of Germany to send troops into Roumania would be followed by a terrible hue and outcry on the part of the French, who would like nothing better than the opportunity thus to show that Germany has sinister designs on the banks of the Danube.

If France would consent to use its influence to stop these persecutions, in conference with the other powers, the result might be effected. But this would be to aid the Germans in keeping Prince Charles on the throne, and to weaken the radical party in Roumania—who are all enthusiastic admirers of France and French policy—toward the Germans; so that in these singular political combinations and sympathies the Jews are the great sufferers. The misfortune for Roumania is the

fact of a liberal constitution for a people that is in nowise prepared for it. A humane prince is thus powerless against the greatest barbarities committed by a party calling itself liberal, and committing outrages in the name of progress. Its unfitness for liberal institutions was clearly proved on a recent occasion when a jury in a case of murder of some Jews notoriously released the murderers and condemned to prison some of the Jews who had escaped massacre. And still these liberal institutions of Roumania are lauded to the skies by French publicists and journalists of a certain stripe, who in their enthusiasm for Roumania do their fair share in making this semi-barbarous people vain of their most shameful deeds.

These persecutions against Jews and Germans have largely increased since the war of 1870. German artisans and scholars, merchants and railroad builders, have been made to feel it most painfully. The radical leader, Bratiano, recently declared that he would rather wade in the mud than travel on railroads built by the Germans, and appealed to his countrymen to form associations all over the country with a view to break off all intercourse with the Jews and the Germans by refusing to buy from or sell to them, or in any manner to associate with them, and to the press to oppose every effort at German colonization, which had been recommended as a means to revive the industries of the country and develop its resources. In these sentiments and aims Bratiano is supported by many journalists, and by municipal magistrates and teachers in the public schools, and these teachings and instigations have borne a rich crop of outrages. Houses have been plundered, synagogues destroyed, cemeteries desecrated, wives and daughters outraged, and men and children murdered. And the slightest provocations are sufficient to start these outrages. Some time ago a renegade Jew from Russia robbed a Greek church of some of its valuable ornaments, and hid them, by chance or intent, in an immense building where lived a Jewish Rabbi and some forty Jewish families. The things were discovered, and the thief, to shield himself, declared the Rabbi a party to the crime. This was enough to start the excitement, and immediately there commenced a fearful attack on Rabbi and people, all that could be found, and after these had suffered veritable martyrdom, a judicial investigation proved them all

innocent and perfectly ignorant of the fellow who had stolen the articles and thus inculpated them. But the persecution had continued for days, until the Jews had lost nearly all they possessed, and it was only arrested by the authorities when the mob could find nothing more to steal. The Jews then received the poor satisfaction of being declared innocent, and the permission to depart unpunished. They were fortunate in escaping with their lives through such an excitement.

On another occasion a child was lost for some days. At last it was found wandering about in the porches of an old synagogue. This was enough to start an outcry—the child had evidently been stolen by the Jews and hidden in the building that they might have Christian blood with which to sprinkle their door-posts on the occasion of the approaching Passover. This flimsy story flew like wildfire, and in a few minutes every Jew who was so unfortunate as to be on the public street was attacked with stones and clubs, and the outrage soon extended to their homes and synagogues, growing into fearful proportions, and resulting in cruelties that would put to blush the Parisian Commune. This outbreak was in a fair way of extending all over the provinces where the persecutors could find victims, especially in the large cities, when the foreign consuls in Bucharest joined in a protest to the government against this cruel bestiality toward the Jews; and this combined action of the foreign representatives was officially communicated to their respective governments, who again threatened to interfere.

This threat starts up the Turk; he reprimands the prince; the latter appeals to the police and military authorities to be vigilant in suppressing the disorders; these authorities succeed in getting into operation by the time the excesses have exhausted themselves for the time being, and nobody suffers but the innocent Jews. And it is probable that these disgraceful scenes will be repeated from time to time until some great revolution shall wipe out Roumania or place it unconditionally into the hands of some power strong enough to control the violence of its ignorant and prejudiced masses. But as long as the European Chess-board has its pieces so arranged that not one can be moved in the least without alarming all the others,

so long the kings will look out for their own interests and leave the pawns to shift for themselves.

The peculiar position of Roumania, surrounded by so many nationalities that would gladly possess her, has really given her existence, and still secures it to her, notwithstanding her apparent unworthiness of this distinction and favor. On the east is Russia, separated only by a small river, across which this great power can look and perceive a portion of her own territory violently wrested from her, and which she will seize the first opportunity to regain. Bulgaria on the south, and the other Slavonian provinces of Turkey, would like nothing better than, under the stimulating influence of a revival of the Russo-Greek Church, to take Roumania and make a Slavonic Confederation of the Danube. In the west, Austro-Hungary would not hesitate a moment to seize and incorporate Roumania, with a view to possess the fertile land and an unobstructed passage to the Black Sea, if the other powers were not on the watch to prevent it. Swarms of foreign agents from France and Russia help keep up an agitation in the interior, and prepare parties to favor one or the other of these foreign interests when the time to decide shall arrive; and so the peculiar position of the new nation in regard to her surroundings seems to protect her from interference from without or within, no matter how strong may be the appeal of the sufferers.

The true course for Roumania to follow would be to tend to her own internal development during these dissensions of her enemies, and in the meanwhile to become so strong and respectable that when they are prepared to absorb her she might be prepared to resist, and claim the sympathies of Europe, not from position or policy, but because of her worth and the most significant fact that a strong semi-oriental nation seems to be needed on the Lower Danube as a sort of transition land between the Orient and the Occident. And she has the means to accomplish this in her midst in the very elements which she is insanely trying to drive away. But instead of tending to her own political and industrial development, she is continually fighting over the battles of half the Continent of Europe. During the entire war between Germany and France she was in a fever of excitement and exasperation, and when the German forces entered Paris the principal radical journal appeared

with a deep black border, to give, as it said, an outward expression to its internal grief at the barbaric invasion of the Teutonic hordes into the center of civilization.

When in Bucharest the Germans desired to assemble, as they did throughout the world, to celebrate a "festival of Peace," they were not allowed to do it unmolested—almost the only instance the world over. They were disturbed by noisy crowds in the religious services of the festival, and their banquet was totally broken up by the invasion of a brutal mob that smashed in windows, burst in doors, and demolished all the preparations for a joyous feast. Even the German consul-general was attacked with stones with the cry of "Death to the Germans! Long live the French!" The conservative premier, Ghika, who doubtless greatly regretted the outrage, did his best, with the aid of the tardy police, to quell the disturbance, but nobody heeded him. Young Roumania was on its mettle, and was determined that neither banquet should be eaten nor speech be delivered; and so it was—the rioters having it all their own way until the military and the firemen appeared, when the latter dispersed the mob by discharging streams of water on the people.

But the Young Roumanians found that they had no helpless Jews to deal with this time. Bismarck demanded full reparation for the insult, and received it. The entire ministry fell. Some eighty individuals, mainly students and policemen, were convicted of being engaged in the disorder, and even the chief of police was discharged. The Sultan informed the ruling prince, who, as a German, was of course innocent of the outrage, that on its repetition thirty thousand Turkish troops would march in and keep order. The Prince in return replied that in future every effort would be made to protect the Germans from violence or insult, but showed very evident chagrin that the Sultan had taken this occasion to remind him that the Turk was still the supreme power in Roumania.

Since then the Germans have been let alone, and the Young Roumanians have confined their amusements to the defenseless Jews. The spirit is the same, but they indulge it where there is less danger. This new ministry lived but a little while; it met at the outset the accusation that it was the creation of foreign influence, and received the nickname of "Prussian."

The opposition did nothing but oppose, and at last succeeded in defeating the ministry by a majority of six. The Prince, however, determined not to yield, ordered the ministers to retain their places, and dissolved the Assembly, while the latter left the hall with the cry of "Live the Constitution!" This was the first decided effort on the part of the Prince to introduce a sterner *régime* than had been adopted by his predecessors, and as the people knew that the garrison was remanded to the barracks, and was ready at any moment to put down a hostile demonstration, they thought it best quietly to disperse.

It was supposed for a little while that this bold step on the part of Prince Charles would cost him his throne; but he was fully sustained by encouraging telegrams from Berlin and Vienna, the publication of which gave a moral influence stronger than any military demonstration that he could have made. The dissolution of the Chambers was not, however, regarded so much a solution as a postponement of the troubles between people and prince, for the elections to follow for a new house could alone solve the difficulty. These were attended with great agitation, and the "Reds" made a desperate effort to stir up the country against the "imported prince" whom they desired to banish. Their efforts proved fruitless, for the thinking classes became more and more convinced that, however much the country needed regeneration, these fierce, irreconcilable radicals were not the men to do it. Charles received numerous addresses from the most influential families of the various provinces, assuring him of their support, and inviting him to visit their sections of country for a personal acquaintance with the inhabitants.

The elections resulted in a complete defeat of the "Reds;" not one of their prominent candidates was elected, while most of the leading conservatives were returned by a large majority. The nervous agitation attending the election was largely owing to the fact, which was generally understood, that in case the Prince was not supported in the popular elections he would abdicate and leave the country. His triumphant indorsement was therefore the cause of much joy throughout the land, and was followed by popular festivals in Bucharest and other cities.

This looked like the commencement of a new era for Rou-

mania, and the Prince himself seemed greatly encouraged. He had passed through so many trials, and found the Roumanians in so many respects unreasonable and ungovernable, that he was evidently determined this time to carry out his oft-expressed resolution of abdication, feeling that it was utterly hopeless for him to attempt to effect any reform or do any good. This indorsement induced him to try once more, and he opened the new Chambers with very encouraging words, and with the recommendation of a series of practical measures of great utility to the civil and industrial advancement of the country. His words were warmly received, and he and his ministry were assured of a steady support on the part of the Assembly. And thus a great crisis was safely passed through, for the departure of Prince Charles under the circumstances would have agitated the country to its greatest depths, and most certainly have endangered its continuance as an independent nationality. Whether much will have been gained in the end the future alone can decide; but history will accord to the present ruler the credit of having faithfully endeavored, under the most embarrassing circumstances, to administer the trust reposed in him.

Among the first measures of the new legislative body were a few efforts to correct hasty legislation on the part of their predecessors. The constitution adopted was adapted to a fully developed and highly civilized people, but neither its spirit nor its workings were understood by the great mass of the Roumanians. They had introduced jury trials, and under the system robbery and murder had increased in an alarming degree. They had established full liberty of the press, and it had led to the most revolting and alarming abuses. They had introduced universal suffrage, and the ignorant masses voted for the most ridiculous and inconsistent measures. Finally, they had prohibited foreign colonization on their soil, and their fertile plains were lying waste for the want of intelligent culture. To grapple with questions like these in a statesmanlike manner they needed the experience of a slowly-developed past which they did not possess. It seemed like pigmies undertaking the work of giants. It was a rare task to adapt the governments of modern civilization to so incongruous a community, and the wisest men might be excused for failures in many instances where the first efforts must be experiments on virgin soil.

It was believed that the most imperative need of the country was a system of railroads to develop its resources, and a very extensive one, recommended by foreign capitalists, was adopted, and made a national undertaking with national obligations. But the system itself was so entirely out of proportion to the ability of the respective regions either to construct or sustain it that all parties connected with the enterprise soon became embarrassed, and vast sums were lost in the undertaking. The contractors were soon unable to continue their work, and ceased to prosecute it when the Roumanian government refused to pay the interest on their obligations to the amount of many millions, which in the meanwhile had passed into the hands of foreign holders. These parties felt that they had been victimized, and were influential enough in Germany to induce the government to interfere in their behalf and threaten summary measures if they were not treated justly. The whole matter has been the cause of complications of sufficient magnitude to endanger again the existence of the nation, for Bismarck threatened to appeal to the Sultan to interfere in his suzerain right, and any action on the part of foreign governments acknowledging this continued suzerainty of Turkey is dangerous to the independence of Roumania. This Damocles sword of their railroad embroglio continues to hang over them, and is likely to do so for years.

This unfortunate complication has of late absorbed the attention of the nation almost exclusively, to the great detriment of other matters of intense import to the people at large. The question of the reorganization of the Roumanian Greek Church is one of prime necessity. The position of the clergy is poorly defined in the new constitution, and they therefore continue to exercise a power in the Church which is quite incompatible with the spirit of that document. They are quite often induced to enter the political arena, and, with their influence with the common people, they can easily effect an election to the Chambers, where their votes are seldom on the side of true progress.

But above all, the Roumanians need some system of popular education whereby the masses may be raised from their exceeding ignorance, and made capable of comprehending their situation and their responsibilities. There is probably no greater anomaly in the world than the comparatively libera^l

constitution of Roumania for a people who have not the remotest idea of political rights and privileges, and, to tell the truth, no great desire to enjoy them. The masses are still governed by their prejudices, which are those handed down to them from the Middle Ages, and are thus the prey of political adventurers or ignorant enthusiasts. With such material at their command, the wildest and most unprincipled men can start or keep alive persecutions that are not only cruel and illogical, but of the greatest disadvantage to the country, and in direct antagonism to the spirit of the age. It is thus that the Rosettis and Bratianos of the Young Roumanian party can assemble under their red flag the crowds of followers eager for any attack on the Jews, or for a fray with the Germans as intrusive foreigners on their soil, while, in fact, these parties are indispensable to the development of the nation. The periodical return of these cruelties has of late become so frequent and so revolting that the sentiment of Christendom will soon insist on some interference in the interest of humanity, regardless of national sensitiveness or the danger of disturbing the equilibrium of power among European courts.

ART. VI.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, October, 1872. (Philadelphia.)—1. Roger Williams as an Author. 2. The Three Systems of Belief in China. 3. Homer and the Old Testament. 4. The Themes and Methods of Apostolic Preaching. 5. Dr. John Clarke.

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, October, 1872. (Cincinnati.)—1. American Civilization. 2. "Judaic Baptism." 3. The Philosophy of "Getting Religion." 4. The Vatican Council and the Old Catholics. 5. Collegiate Education for the People.

MERCERSBURG REVIEW, October, 1872. (Philadelphia.)—1. Nature and Grace. 2. The Old and the New. 3. The Sacramental Theory of the Heidelberg Catechism. 4. Why are we Reformed? 5. Faith, a Normal Activity of the Soul. 6. The Inscription of the Catacombs. 7. Christianity and the Church.

NEW ENGLANDER, October, 1872. (New Haven.)—1. The Preaching to the Spirits in Prison. 2. Our National Banks. 3. Cyprian and his Times. 4. The New Lives of Sir Walter Raleigh. 5. Music as a Fine Art. 6. The Oberlin Council. 7. Sectarian Symbols.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, October, 1872. (Boston.)—1. Herder. 2. The Germanic World of Gods. 3. Niccolini's Anti-Papal Tragedy. 4. American Novels. 5. Kristofer Janson, and the Reform of the Norwegian Language. 6. The Political Campaign of 1872.

PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, October, 1872. (New York.)—1. The Righteousness of God. 2. Faith: Its Place and Prerogative. 3. Florentine Philosophy in the Days of the Medici. 4. Annihilation of the Wicked. 5. John Wesley, His Character and Opinions. 6. Outlines of J. A. Dorner's System of Theology. 7. Japan. 8. The Early History of the Ottoman Turks.

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, October, 1872. (Gettysburg.)—1. The Church. 2. Explosions of Steam Boilers. 3. Application of the Principle of the Reformation. 4. Free Self-Government. 5. Subscription to the Confessions. 6. Faith the Essential Element for Right Living. 7. The Latest Yoke of Bondage; or, Dr. Finney's Ministerial Test.

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM, A CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, October, 1872. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Address to the Conference of the Evangelical Union Church of Scotland, Convened in Glasgow, September, 1872. 2. Cumberland Presbyterianism Teaches Salvation by Grace, without Implicating God in the Destruction of the Wicked. 3. The New Covenant. 4. Exegesis of Acts ii, 38. 5. A Solemn Charge. 6. Perseverance of the Saints. 7. A View of the Fundamental Aspect of the Application of the Principle of the Reformation by Luther and Melancthon. 8. The Rationale of Prayer.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, October, 1872. (Boston.)—1. John Murray. 2. The Genesis of Science. 3. The Preparation for Christianity. 4. Sears's "Heart of Christ." 5. A Popular Objection to Universalism Reviewed. 6. Letters of Murray and Richards. 7. The Gospel Minister.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, AND THEOLOGICAL ECLECTIC, October, 1872. (Andover.)—1. Patristic Views of the Two Genealogies of Our Lord. 2. The Progress of Christ's Kingdom in its Relation to Civilization. 3. On "The Man of Sin," 2 Thess. ii, 3-9. 4. Revelation and Inspiration. 5. Infant Baptism and a Regenerated Church-Membership Irreconcilable. 6. The Influence of the Pulpit. 7. The Three Fundamental Methods of Preaching—Preaching Extempore. 8. Notes on Egyptology.

It would seem that the subject of

THE RELATION OF INFANTS TO THE CHURCH

is, under the liberal supervision of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, undergoing a fresh revision. The Editors say: "Having inserted in a previous number an Article favoring the proposition that the infants of professing believers ought to be baptized, and are constituted by their baptism members of the visible Church, and having inserted in the present number an Article favoring the proposition that infants are not members of the visible Church and ought not to be baptized, the Editors of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* expect to insert, in a future number, an Article favoring the proposition that the infant children of Church-members ought to be baptized, but are not made members of the visible Church by that ordinance."

The Fifth Article is a candid and catholic view of the subject by a learned Baptist writer, partly in review of an Article in our own Quarterly by the late lamented Dr. Nadal, who, as our readers will recollect, sustained Infant Baptism on the ground that *the Church did not require regeneration in her membership*. Although we hold this to be the most unscriptural, most dangerous, and most un-

Methodistical of all the views proposed, we did not feel at liberty to exclude the Church from hearing what one of her most learned and loyal sons had to say in its behalf. The Christian Church, in our view, aims, however imperfectly the aim is accomplished, to be the Church of the Regenerate. Dr. Nadal's view, we think, contradicts our Thirteenth Article of Faith, which declares that "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of *faithful* men." In regard to which it may be affirmed, 1. That the unregenerate are not "faithful" men; 2. That in the view of the Church the baptized infant is a "faithful" man. If "seekers" have in former times been admitted by our Church to the "class," it is not properly as members of the Church. We never knew a "seeker" to be baptized; he can be dropped by the pastor without trial; and all such should be, so soon as they cease to be sincere "seekers." They are received into the "class" simply in order to receive the aid of a spiritual adviser so long as they feel the need of advice and are disposed to profit by it. The present Reviewer, as a Baptist, of course agrees with us in rejecting the doctrine of an unregenerate Church. He differs from us in inferring, therefrom, the impropriety of Infant Baptism.

The indefiniteness of opinion on this subject, described by Mr. Marsh as general, certainly exists in our own Church. It arises, we believe, (and in this entire Article we desire to be understood as speaking not representatively but individually,) from the fact that a majority of our Church has unconsciously varied from our own standards. A large majority has, if we mistake not, contrary to Arminius, to Wesley, to Fletcher, and to our Articles of Faith, come to hold that *the living infant is neither justified nor regenerate, and becomes so only on condition of death*. This we understand from Mr. Marsh to be the present Baptist view. It seems to imply a present infant condemnation; and at any rate, under the Calvinistic view of an irrelative, unforeknowing decree, both of foreordination and reprobation, the logical result is eternal infant damnation. This last doctrine Mr. Marsh repudiates in behalf of all Calvinists of the present day; but, accepting fully his rejection of the dogma, we aver that logically he ought to accept it. Here, if pressed closely, he would find himself involved in a "puzzle" quite as perplexing as any he imputes to Pedobaptists.

The theory which, in our individual view, comes most nearly to our best standards, is very nearly in Mr. Marsh's words: "That infants are to be baptized because under the atonement they are

born regenerate." Dr. Nadal refers to this theory, and repudiates it as being "certainly in the very teeth of the teachings of the Orthodox Church in all ages." When this view was advocated by Mercein, Hibbard, and Gilbert Haven, it was rejected very indignantly by most of our best thinkers; and, in humorous allusion to the initials of the last writer, (now one of our Bishops,) it was said that G. H. stood for "Great Heretic." Yet we believe it clear that Dr. Hibbard's view is about the view of the Church, if her formulas are to decide the question.

One minute but important correction, however, is to be made. Arminius, Wesley, Fletcher, and Fisk could not be said to hold that infants are "born regenerate." The true statement would be that they are born into the world depraved; but, as Fisk expresses it, "the atonement meets them with its provisions at their entrance." Their justification or regeneration, so far as it exists, is not *congenital* but *post-genital*. The atonement fills this probationary world with its influence, and the human being receives his atoning justification consequent upon his having entered into it. It is as if a room were filled with a purifying influence, and a leper is cleansed by entering within its walls. The question is not as to the genuineness or the depth of the depravity as derived from Adam, or from the immediate parent. That depravity is done up in all the elements of the foetal man. Nor does regeneration, infant or adult, absolutely remove it until completed at the glorification; for both infant and adult still retain susceptibility to temptation and sin, mortality, disease, and death, until the final renovation.

And here comes in our reply to Dr. Nadal's argument against infant regeneration, pushed by him with much emphasis, drawn from the fact of the sinfulness of the growing and grown-up race. It is much the same argument as Watson pushes against the non-depravity of the race drawn from the uniform wickedness of the race. But Nadal's argument has none of the force of Watson's. Our inherent depravity is not entirely removed by regeneration until the regeneration is completed at the resurrection. For the best of us, the maintenance of our saved or regenerate state is a work of care, skill, and firm volition. These qualities the unnurtured child does not possess, and hence falls an easy victim to sin. The nurtured child may retain an unforfeited Christian character. It is at this age, indeed, that docility to truth, conscientiousness, and simple piety often unfold themselves.

Here let us observe, 1. Our later writers do not rigidly insist on

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXV.—9

the word regeneration as the technic to designate this *saved* state of the living infant. That word is framed in Scripture normally for adults. And it may be objected as absurd that a man should be generated and regenerated in instantaneous succession. This is not, indeed, a very valid objection. What is meant by these writers is, that *the state of the saved living infant is essentially the same for an infant as the state into which regeneration brings the adult*. And so infant justification is, for the infant, the *same as that justification into which faith brings the adult believer*. The adult believer is not baptized—let our Baptist brother mark this—because he *believes*; but because he is *justified* and *regenerated* in sequence to his belief. *The infant, possessing that same justification, is entitled to that same baptism.*

2. This does not imply baptismal regeneration or ritualism. The infant is not regenerate because he is baptized, but is baptized because he is virtually a believer, and so virtually justified and regenerate.

3. This avoids the danger of an unregenerate Church-membership. If the infant so grows up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord as never to lose his saved state, (no imaginary case,) he needs no conversion. He will bring forth the fruits showing him entitled to an unforfeited Church-membership. Otherwise, his membership is forfeited, as in any other case of apostasy. Nevertheless, not only most children, but most adults, often need converting over and over again.

With regard to our standard authors, in view of this discussion, we reproduce a few paragraphs published by us in our October Quarterly for 1864 in noticing a book by Miss Beecher :

Miss Beecher announces that a new development is taking place in the Methodist Episcopal Church, which, she imagines, will result in childhood Church-membership. We doubt the *newness* of the matter she describes. To show how great our advance is, she quotes a passage from Arminius, in which that great doctor taught that infants are by "the covenant comprehended and adjudged in their parents," and so have "sinned" and become "obnoxious to God's wrath." But if she will turn to his works, vol. i, page 318, (American edition,) she will find that by that same covenant there is, in his opinion, a provision of grace in which children are so included, as putative believers, "as not to seem to be obnoxious to condemnation." Both of these views are consistent, and may be correct. Condemned by the covenant in Adam, living children, like believers, may be justified in Christ. If Miss Beecher will turn to Fletcher's Checks, vol. i, page 461, she will find that writer expressly maintaining the doctrine of both the "justification" and the "regeneration" of living infants. In a note he adds these remarkable words: "Those who start at every expression they are not used to will ask if *our Church admits the justification of infants?* I answer, *UNDOUBTEDLY*; since her clergy, by her direction, say over myriads of infants, 'We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it has pleased thee to REGENERATE *this infant.*'" He then proceeds

to prove that this *regeneration* is antecedent to baptism, and universal. And he instructs us so to construe his mention of "the regeneration of infants," in his Appeal, (*a work adopted in our course of ministerial study*.) Part V, Inference 7, as designating regeneration unconditional upon baptism, and of course as existing in the case of every *living* infant. So firmly convinced was Fletcher that Adamic depravity does not preclude infant regeneration, that it was in a powerful work in favor of depravity that he maintained such regeneration. If this be a new development, Miss B. may be thus assured it is by no means "a new doctrine." According to Fletcher's interpretation, indeed, our infant baptismal service teaches the same doctrine. Our baptismal Scripture lesson from Mark x, 13, etc., which declares "of such is the kingdom of heaven," teaches, in his view, that *infants are truly born of the Spirit as ground of their now being baptismally "born of water."* They are to receive the outward sign because they *have received* the inward grace. We say not that these teachings of Fletcher are an article of our Church faith, nor that they are true or false. We only say that they are found in one of the standards which has always been put by our Church into the hands of her young ministers; and such is even there affirmed to be the doctrine of our standing Ritual. If Fletcher's interpretations be true, Miss B. will specially observe, *we have been proclaiming living infant regeneration at every infant baptism from the very foundation of our Church.* But this Arminian and Fletcherian view is very different from her Pelagian denial of a depravity by nature derived from Adam.

Mr. Wesley's views of the baptismal Scripture lesson appear scarce different from Fletcher's. "The kingdom of heaven" there mentioned he held to be the "kingdom set up in the world," (see his comment on Mark x, 14, and Matt. xix 14.) that is, the regenerate earthly Church; he held that little children "have a right to enter" that kingdom or Church; and that "the members of the kingdom" are such, that is, "natural" children, or "grown persons of a childlike spirit." That membership he interprets to be not contingent and prospective, or conditioned upon death, but real and present. And yet he believed that no one can be within that kingdom who is not regenerate. (See his note on John iii, 5.) We have, then, the syllogistic premises: All members of the kingdom of heaven are regenerate; Children are such members; and then what conclusion a logician like Mr. Wesley would draw we leave others to decide.

Dr. Fisk's view appears in the following words:

"Although all moral depravity, derived or contracted, is damning in its nature, still, by virtue of the atonement, the destructive effects of derived depravity are counteracted; and guilt is not imputed until by a voluntary rejection of the Gospel remedy man makes the depravity of his nature the object of his own choice. Hence, although, abstractly considered, this depravity is destructive to the possessors, *yet through the grace of the Gospel ALL ARE BORN FREE FROM CONDEMNATION.* So the Apostle Paul: "As by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."—*Calvinistic Controversy.*

Here we are told that all are born "free from condemnation;" and this freedom from condemnation is identical with the "justification" named by St. Paul. And this freedom from condemnation or justification (not merely a title to contingent prospective justification) is at birth upon each living individual infant; and universal, being in spite of our depravity derived from the atonement. The infant does not wait for death before he is justified. Death, actual or approaching, is no condition of salvation.

In regard to Mr. Fletcher's doctrine of infant justification we remark:

1. No one affirms that the regeneration of an infant, as taught by Fletcher, is psychologically absurd, or contrary to human or Christian consciousness. *The doctrine of infant regeneration, either unconditional or conditional upon baptism, is no new doctrine, but has been a dogma in all the great sections of the Church, whether Greek, Roman, or Protestant.* This is a valid contradiction to Dr. Nadal's statement quoted above, that infant regeneration is "in the teeth of the teachings of the Orthodox Church of all ages." The regeneration of the infant is nothing different in nature from that in the adult, except as modified by its subject; and the use of the term is in both cases equally proper, involving no innovation in theology of

either thought or language. If an infant can be depraved it can also be undepraved; if it can be *positively unregenerate* it can also be *regenerate*. In the infant nature as truly as in the adult there may exist all the potencies, predispositions, and predeterminate tendencies, natural or gracious, for an actual, though not responsible, moral nature, good or bad.

2. The doctrine of depravity is neither invalidated in nor modified by the doctrine of infant regeneration, whether unconditional or conditioned upon birth, baptism, or death, actual or approaching. In either case the depravity comes from Adam, is by nature, and is equally complete; and, in either case, regeneration comes from Christ and is by grace, being extra to and above nature. The unborn John the Baptist was "filled with the Holy Ghost," (Luke i, 15,) and "leaped" at the approach of the mother of the unborn Saviour. The unborn Jesus was "that holy thing." And such cases at once explode the objection of the "manifest absurdity" of "regeneration between conception and birth." Nor is there any more absurdity in the infant being *regenerated* between conception and birth, than in his being *depraved* at conception or between conception and birth. And this would seem to finish, too, all the argument about the absurdity of generation and regeneration being simultaneous.

3. If Arminius, Wesley, Fletcher, and Fisk are right in their positions, then the Arminian doctrine of falling from grace must be true. All adult sinners are apostates. And we see the reason why Calvinists must reject those positions unless they would become Arminians. All who become unregenerate or unjustified, that is, all adult sinners, as Fletcher expresses it, have "sinned away the justification of infants." Or, as Fisk says, the "man makes the depravity of his nature the object of his choice," and not until then is "sin imputed unto him." If there be those happy exceptions, who have evidently not "sinned away the justification of infants," Fletcher would doubtless have held them to be Christians, and at responsible age have admitted them to communion. And an Arminian like Fletcher would have no difficulty with our Lord's declaration to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again," etc.; for he would understand that such words are addressed to all apostates, that is, to all adult sinners, entirely irrespective of any past experience, whether of an infant or a previous adult regeneration.

To all this we may add that the Seventeenth of our Articles of Faith declares that "Baptism is . . . a sign of regeneration;" and that "The baptism of children is to be retained in the Church." That is, children are to receive the "sign of regeneration." But, surely, the sign ought not to be conferred where the reality does not and may never exist. The "outward sign of an inward grace" is a false sign where there is no "inward grace."

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, October, 1872. (London.)—1. The "Servant of the Lord" in Isaiah. 2. Of the Beautiful in Worship. 3. Phenomenalism in Morals. 4. Frederick Denison Maurice. 5. The Philosophy of Prayer. 6. The Problem of Job. 7. The Presbytery of Wandsworth, erected in 1572. 8. Reprinted Article—The Antagonism of Religion and Culture.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, October, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Corea. 2. New Shakspearean Interpretation. 3. Memorials of Baron Stockmar. 4. Terrestrial Magnetism. 5. The Fiji Islands. 6. The Life of Henry Thomas Colebrooke. 7. The Progress of Medicine and Surgery. 8. Grote's Aristotle. 9. The Past and Future of Naval Tactics.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Duke of Wellington as a Cabinet Minister. 2. The Completion of St. Paul's. 3. Baron Stockmar. 4. The Consciousness of Dogs. 5. Velasquez. 6. Journal of a French Diplomatist in Italy. 7. East Africa Slave Trade. 8. The Position of Parties.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Heroes of Hebrew History. 2. Pindar. 3. Free Public Libraries. 4. The Descent of Man. 5. The Scotch Education Settlement of 1872. 6. France: Her Position and Prospects. 7. The *Æsthetics* of Physicism.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1872. (London.)—1. Music and Poetry: Their Origin and Functions. 2. William Tyndale. 3. The Higher Ministry of Nature. 4. New England Puritan Literature: Michael Wigglesworth. 5. Lutheranism. 6. London: Civic and Social. 7. The Bampton Lecture on Methodism.

The London, under the editorship of Rev. Dr. Rigg, sustains well a comparison with the other British Quarterlies. It is modeled after the standing pattern, in style, size, and, unfortunately, in the practice of withholding the names of the writers of the Articles. This rule was adopted by the original of the Quarterlies, the Edinburgh, from the fact that the clique of fast young Whigs who started that concern possessed more brains than reputation as yet, and the revelation of the authorship would have destroyed the power of the production. As our conservative friend, Mr. Bull, is still fond of perpetuating an institute long after the reason for its existence has ceased, from the pure respectability, not to say the absurdity, of the thing, this unwise custom seems to be held by all the English Quarterlies with the sacredness of a fetic. The best French and German high periodicals give the names. Even our own old North American, that so long aped its English predecessors, has, in accordance with the spirit of "modern thought," commenced the habit of placing the full name of the writer at the bottom of each Article, like a signature to a bank-note. The withholding of the names cheats the reader of a pleasure, and the author of his just right. To the reader of a good Article it is a just and honorable enjoyment to know the name and to thank and honor the man by whose labor and talent he has been gratified and benefited. To the author belongs a right to the just reputation accruing from his productions; and last of all should a Quarterly, which remunerates most poorly of all periodicals, cheat the author of his fame as well as of his money. It is, indeed, often the case that an accident is manufactured to enable his name to leak out; or a newspaper paragonist is

made to whisper the secret very slyly to the public; which is simply adding charlatanry to injustice. The mysterious *we* of the early Edinburgh did represent an unknown and even dreaded power. But that time has passed, and Mr. *We* is a sham, and an Article covered under its prestige has no more weight than if signed with the name of its author. Our own humble Quarterly has nearly created a small literary republic, in the last few years, by calling out contributors, and announcing their names.

The Seventh Article is an able and courteous refutation of objections against Methodism made by the Bampton Lecturer for 1871.

The following passage says what is no more than truth in regard to

THE COMPLETENESS OF METHODIST THEOLOGY.

"We must remind the Lecturer of what he must needs know, though he takes no pains to show that he is aware of it, that Methodism, while faithful to its peculiar lessons, claims to be a faithful teacher of the whole compass of theological science. It teaches its ministers, and through them its people, the "truth as it is in Jesus," without the omission of any one element of that truth. It strives also to exhibit Christian doctrine in its integrity and in its "proportion," as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures. The faith delivered to the saints has lost nothing in its keeping. It has its system of theology complete in all its parts; basing its existence, and its work in the world, not upon any one or two specific doctrines, but upon one broad foundation of Christian truth. The secession from the Church of England which this book deplors has not involved a separation from the Catholic faith of the Church of England, which, in all fundamentals concerning the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, sin, redemption, justification, holiness of inward experience and outward practice, the Church and sacraments, the future with its issues, and the Holy Scriptures, which are the infallible depository and standard of all these doctrines, is held by the Methodists with a unanimity, tenacity, and resistance to innovation that affords an example to the Mother Church herself. As to the entire body of

strictly evangelical truth, and setting aside certain points of order and discipline, Methodism is, as a whole, far more faithful than the Church of England to the teaching of the fathers and founders of the Anglican Church.

"In this fact we cannot but rejoice; if our protest seems to savor of self-gratification and boasting, we are compelled to it by the studied silences of such essays as those of the Bampton Lecturer. We will be bold, and say yet more. There cannot be found in Christendom a community which, by the grace of God, is more faithful to that summary of truth which is universally acknowledged to contain the principles of the regeneration and life of the world. Methodism, whether in England, or in the universal dominions of England, or in America, has never given birth to a heresy; some few faint appearances of a tendency to unsettle the foundations of doctrine as to the person of Christ have been instantly and thoroughly repressed; and with regard to points of less importance than that, the sensitiveness of the community has been so vigilant that the originators of views out of harmony with the common faith have been compelled to retire. It is needless here to discuss the nature of the doctrinal tests that have been so rigorously employed; nor is it necessary to inquire into the grounds of this steadfast uniformity of doctrine. The fact is evident, and it is a most remarkable one. Year after year, hundreds of young men are sent out into the ministry at home and abroad, the soundness of whose faith may, generally speaking, be relied on. The annual Conferences of Methodism in various parts of the world exhibit the spectacle of some thousands of pastors who are of one accord and of one mind as to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity; so perfectly of one mind, that any serious variation from the truth on the part of any one of these thousands would surely lead to his separation from the teaching ministry. This is a fact that perhaps has no strict parallel in the Christendom of the present day. And it ought to be known, and taken into account, by any writer who makes the doctrinal relations of Methodism to the Church of England, or to the Church universal, his study."

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1872. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Goths at Ravenna. 2. Immortality. 3. Our Railway System. 4. The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. 5. The Present Phase of Prehistoric Archaeology. 6. Sir Henry Lawrence.

The Fifth Article of this able organ of the English Independents strenuously maintains the reality of the Palæolithic Man as far back as, perhaps, the pre-glacial age of England, unmeasured millions of years ago.

Our readers may recall that in a late number we gave an abridgment of an Article on the Palæolithic and Neolithic ages. It maintained that the Neolithic flint-stones were genuine artificial implements, but within the Mosaic chronology; while the Palæolithic were of no human workmanship. The following is the statement of the present writer touching

THE PALÆOLITHIC PERIOD AND ITS IMPLEMENTS :

“The rudely-chipped flint implements, discovered in the river gravels of France, Germany, and Britain, prove the existence of man in North-western Europe at a time so remote from the present that some valleys, such as that of the Somme, have been cut down by the existing rivers to a depth of from eighty to a hundred feet in the interval. And the bones associated with them in the same strata show that the fauna differed materially from that now living in Europe. The lion, for example, which in the days of Herodotus lived in the mountains of Thrace in sufficient numbers to descend in bands to prey upon the baggage camels of Xerxes, then ranged through France, Germany, and Britain; and the spotted hyena, which is now found only in Southern Africa, was found in abundance as far north as Yorkshire, and from the pillars of Hercules as far east as the frontiers of Russia. The grizzly bear of the Rocky Mountains extended as far to the south-west as the shores of the Mediterranean; and the musk sheep, which at present dwells in the inclement region of the extreme north of America, lived in Europe as far south as a line passing through the Alps and the Pyrenees. Among the extinct animals, the more important are the great hairy rhinoceros, the mammoth, the Irish elk, and the gigantic cave-bear. To this strange group of animals must be added all those wild species which still inhabit Europe, and among them the reindeer and the bison were incredibly abundant. The flint implements

which prove that man formed part of this fauna, indicate that he was in the lowest stage of culture ; *so rude, indeed, are they, and so unlike those which are at present in use among savage tribes, that it is impossible to make out for what purpose they were employed.* We may indeed rather ask, with Sir John Lubbock, '*To what need of savage life could they not be applied ?*' Besides the larger forms, which for want of better names are known as *spear-heads and sling-stones, flint-scrapers* are found, which from their analogy with those of the Esquimaux must certainly have been used in preparing hides, as well as flint-awls for boring holes and flint-flakes for cutting purposes. This short list exhausts all the known forms of flint implements which have been furnished by the ancient deposits of rivers ; and it tells us little but the mere fact that savage tribes lived in France and Britain while the strata which geologists term pleistocene or quaternary were being accumulated. It is impossible to bring their makers into relation with any races living at the present day."

This admission of the vague character of the implements seems to confirm the argument against the reality of the paleolithic man. The writer gives us the following

TOPOGRAPHY OF THE PALEOLITHIC AGE.

"The conditions under which palæolithic men lived in Europe were very different from those under which we live. On the one hand, the mainland extended to the north-west far into the Atlantic, and Britain and Ireland were united to the mainland, the English Channel and the North Sea being low valleys, through which great rivers flowed, of which the Thames, Rhine, and Severn are merely the smaller branches. In the South of Europe, also, the geography was altogether different, the mainland of Africa being joined to Spain, and a barrier of land extending from Tunis to Southern Italy. Candia also was joined to Greece, and the area of the Mediterranean was reduced to two or three landlocked basins, the positions of which are discovered by the deeper soundings. We can therefore understand why at this time African animals, such as the elephant, the hippopotamus, and spotted hyena, should have found their way into Europe. The very substitution also of a mass of land such as this for a stretch of sea would cause

the climatal extremes to be more strongly marked than at the present time. The summer heat and the winter cold in Central Europe somewhat resembled that of Siberia, and to this may be attributed the strange association of northern and southern animals, such as the hippopotamus and the reindeer, in the area extending from the Alps and Pyrenees to the Baltic. To the north of this the temperature was probably arctic, and to the south it was probably warmer than it is now. In the middle area *mers de glace* occupied certain isolated districts, such as Ireland, the greater part of Scotland, Wales, Lancashire, and Yorkshire, Auvergne and the Pyrenees."

The writer identifies the palæolithic races of Auvergne in France and some other localities with the Esquimaux.

♦ ♦ ♦

German Reviews.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Essays and Reviews. 1873. First Number.) *Essays*: 1. GOTTSCHICK, The Visible and the Indivisible Church—on what this Distinction is based, and what Holy Writ teaches concerning it. 2. ROSCH, The Jesus-Myths of Judaism. *Remarks*: 1. MICHELSEN, On Five Important Passages of the New Testament, concerning the Relation of the Gentiles to the Kingdom of God and to the Gospel. 2. KOSTLIN, The Controversy on the Birth-year of Luther. 3. LINDNER, On Hutten's Book: *De Schismate Extinguendo*. *Reviews*: 1. KLEINERT, Deuteronomy, reviewed by RIEHM. 2. HOLLENBERG, Contributions to Christian Knowledge, reviewed by BESSER. 3. SIEFFERT, The Apologetic Foundations of the science of Christian Faith, reviewed by SCHMIDT.

The introduction to this first number of the new year informs us that in the place of Dr. Hundeshagen, deceased, Dr. Köstlin, of Halle, has become one of the editors-in-chief of this veteran theological quarterly. The theological standpoint of the *Studien* will remain unchanged; it will defend a theology which will steadfastly adhere to the faith of the Apostles and the Reformers, but at the same time endeavor to find for it a new scientific form, in accordance with the consciousness of the living age.

The article by Rösch discusses all the Jewish traditions on the life of Jesus, as they have been collected in the well-known works of Wagenseil, Lightfoot, Eisenmenger, and Schöttgen. It traces the history of each of these traditions, and tries to explain how they may have originated.

As appears from the article of Dr. Köstlin, the controversy of the German theological periodicals on the birth-year of

Luther is not yet closed. Dr. Köstlin comes to the conclusion that we are as yet unable to decide either in favor of the year 1483, which was formerly generally regarded as the birth-year of the great reformer, or whether the year 1484 has more in its favor.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE, (Journal for Historical Theology.) 1873. First Number. 1. GÖRRES, Critical Researches on the Insurrection and the Martyrdom of the Visigothic Prince Hermenigild. 2. BRANDES, A Sect of Quakers in Westphalia.

The history of Arianism in the Spanish kingdoms established by the Visigoths and other German tribes has been elaborately treated in quite a number of recent German works. Among the older works Aschbach's History of the Visigoths, (*Geschichte der Westgothen*, 1827,) was especially valuable; among those of a more recent date the "History of Arianism" and the "Law of the Visigoths," by Helfferich; the "Kings of the Germans," (*Könige der Germanen*), by Felix Dahn, the "Manual of German Antiquities," (*Handbuch deutscher Alterthümer*), by George Pfahler, the history of "Gregory of Tours" by Giesebrecht, have awakened a new interest in the subject. The article by Dr. Franz Görres, in the above number of the Journal for Historical Theology, treats of the history of the last Arian king of the Visigoths, Leovigild, (from 569 to 586,) and in particular of the rebellion of the king's eldest son, Hermenigild, who had joined the Roman communion against his father, and of his final overthrow and execution. The history of this war is an interesting illustration of the want of patriotism which generally has been shown in history by the Catholic subjects of non-Catholic Governments. The rebellion of the Catholic prince was so utterly unjustifiable that even the Catholic writers of those times severely censure it; nevertheless, he was supported by most of the Catholics, Bishops and clergy, and a large portion of the Catholic population, for no other reason than because they hoped he would overthrow the power of an Arian ruler. The Pope subsequently canonized the rebel, notwithstanding the unfavorable opinion which even the contemporaneous writers of the Catholic Church had expressed with regard to him, and ultramontane Church historians, like Cardinal Baronius (*Annal.*

Eccles., vii, p. 656, ed. Antwerp) and the Spaniard, Antonio de Yepes, expressed the monstrous opinion that Hermenigild was right in taking up arms against his heretical father, as "a Catholic must love his religion more than parents, honor, glory, and life." The author of the article, Dr. Görres, appears to have made the history of Spanish Arianism a special study. Besides his article on Hermenigild, he has published another article on the beginning of the reign of King Leovigild, in the historical periodical *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, 1872, and he announces a special monograph on the "Relation of the Visigothic king Leovigild to Catholicism and to the Arian State Church."

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Scientific Theology.) 1873. First Number.—1. HILGENFELD, The Epistle of James. 2. GRIMM, On Philippians 6–11. 3. HINSCH, Researches on the Epistle to the Philippians. 4. HOLTZMANN, Lucas and Josephus. 5. HITZIG, Belthia. 6. O. L., Nathanael. 7. HILGENFELD, John in Asia Minor.

Probably the most novel among the many novel assertions which this organ of the Rationalistic theologians of Germany is wont to make is the contribution in the above number on Nathanael. The author of the article, who merely signs his name O. L., undertakes to prove that the Nathanael mentioned in the fourth Gospel (i, 40–52) is the Apostle Paul. The argumentation in support of this strange opinion is as weak as it is novel.

In the last article Professor Hilgenfeld defends the Johannean origin of the Revelation against a new work by Professor Scholten, of Leyden. (*Der Apostel Johannes in Kleinasien*. Berlin. 1872.)

ART. VII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

THE SECOND CONGRESS OF OLD CATHOLICS.—On September 20, 21, and 22, the Second Congress of the Old Catholics was held at Cologne. Whatever opinion different religious parties may hold of the doctrinal system and the future of this new religious organization of Germany, it is agreed on all sides that this Second Congress by far exceeded in importance the First, which was held one year ago at Munich, and that it must be regarded as one of the most memorable ecclesiastical assemblies of the

year 1872. Dean Stanley, of Westminster, who attended it, is quoted as having said that never in his life had he been present at a meeting when the great religious questions of the day had been discussed with greater ability. All the leaders of the movement were present, and the invitations which had been sent to representative men of other Churches had been accepted by many. Among those who, by letters addressed to the Congress, expressed their sympathies with its labors, were the Anglican Bishop of Lichfield, Professor Pusey and Canon Liddon, of Oxford, Beresford Hope, Professor Ossinin, of St. Petersburg, the Italian Senator Terenzio Mamiani, Dr. Prato, member of the Austrian Reichsrath, Dr. Völk and Baron Stauffenberg, members of the German Reichsrath, Priest Aguayo, of Madrid, and the Patriarch of the Catholic Armenians. Professor Schulte was elected President of the Second Congress, as he had been of the First. The proceedings consisted of meetings of delegates, and of public meetings, in which the most prominent members of the Congress made addresses on the questions which are chiefly agitated in the new religious movement. The meetings of delegates were attended by more than four hundred members. Among those who took part in these meetings were the Old Catholic (Jansenist) Archbishop Loos, of Utrecht; the Anglican Bishops Wordsworth, of Lincoln, Browne, of Ely, and Whittingham, of Maryland; Dean Stanley, of Westminster; Professors John Wordsworth and W. Talbot, of Oxford; Rev. Mr. May, of London, (the representative of the Bishop of London;) Archpriest Yanyshchev, Rector of the Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg; Alexander Kirejev, Adjutant of the Grand Duke Constantine, and Secretary of the Association of the Friends of Enlightenment in St. Petersburg; Rev. Chauncy Langdon, of Florence, (who for many years has been laboring in Italy for the establishment of friendly relations between the Church of England and the reform party in the Catholic Church of Italy;) Rev. R. S. Nevin, rector of the American chapel in Rome; Abbé Michaud and E. de Pressensé, of Paris; Professors Döllinger, Friedrick, Huber, and Cornelius, of Munich; Maassen, of Vienna; Reinkens, of Breslau; Knoodt, Reusch, and Langen, of Bonn; Herzog, of Lucerne; Lutterbeck, of Giessen; Michelis, of Braunsberg; Dr. Hasenclever, member of the German Reichsrath; and Professor Bluntschli, of Heidelberg, (one of the leaders of the Protestantenverein of Germany.) Most of the priests who have joined the Old Catholic movement were present, with a number of professors of gymnasia, of members of town councils and the high judiciary.

In his opening speech the President of the Congress, Professor Schulte, gave a comprehensive review of the history of the Old Catholic movement, and of its present situation. The Old Catholic movement had been begun by men who were Catholics, and wished to remain Catholics, and who on that account refused to recognize doctrines which until recently had been entirely unknown and foreign to the Catholic Church. As all, or nearly all, of the bishops had submitted to the innovation, they had no tribunal before which a suit could be instituted against the Bishop of Rome and the other episcopal innovators, and as the large majority of

the lower clergy had followed the bishops in their apostasy from the true Catholic faith, many of the faithful Catholics were unable to attend divine service and to discharge their religious duties. Thus the Old Catholics were compelled to provide for the establishment of divine worship in their congregations, and, as the Catholic system recognizes the episcopate, to provide for the election of bishops. All the Old Catholics desired far-going reforms in their Church, and to resume the labors which to that end had been made during the last five centuries. But the proper organs for carrying out these reforms were diocesan, provincial, and Ecumenical Synods. So long as these Synods of the Old Catholic Church were not organized, they must be content with abrogating some glaring abuses which individual congregations have a right to deal with. In the meanwhile they would stand on the ground of the positive Christian faith, as it was contained in the Scriptures, and as it was explained by the first seven Ecumenical Councils.

Addresses were then made by the Archbishop of Utrecht and the Bishop of Lincoln, after which the discussion on the plan of the organization of Old Catholic congregations, as proposed by a special committee, was begun. This plan, which, in fourteen paragraphs, carries out the principles indicated in the opening speech of the President, was adopted with only one verbal modification. One of these paragraphs declares that as long as the Old Catholics of Germany have no bishop belonging to the Old Catholic faith, the bishops of the Church of Utrecht (the Jansenists) and the Armenian Church will be asked for the performance of the episcopal functions—in particular of the administration of the sacraments of confirmation and ordination; that, however, the Old Catholics of Germany reserve to themselves the right of re-establishing a regular episcopal jurisdiction by the election of bishops, who are to be chosen by the Old Catholic priests and the representatives of the Old Catholic congregations, and who are at the beginning to labor like the missionary bishops of the ancient Church. The abolition of celibacy, which was demanded by one delegate, was declared not to fall within the competency of this Congress, but the legislation on it was reserved for the authoritative organs of the Church, that is to say, the future bishops and Synods. For the same reason a notion to recognize only the first seven Ecumenical Councils as true councils was almost unanimously voted down.

The Archpriest Tanyashev, of St. Petersburg, expressed his delight with the course of the Old Catholics, and in particular with the resolutions to adhere to the faith and constitution of the ancient Church, and to leave the carrying through of the needed reforms to the lawful authority of the Church. The main point of difference between the Greek and the Latin Churches he declared to be that the well-known addition of *Filioque* to the creed of the universal Church, as agreed upon by a council of the whole Church, had been onesidedly adopted by the Latin Church, without the consent of the Greek. He advocated the just rights of different nationalities within the Church, and, on the other hand, dwelt on the importance of the truly Ecumenical Councils of the entire Church.

and he called on the representatives of Catholic theology in Germany to labor in union with the theologians of the Greek Church for a scientific investigation of Christian truth, in the interest of a final reunion of the Churches.

A committee of seven members was appointed to make all the necessary preparations for the election of a bishop, and to draw a provisional constitution of Old Catholic congregations. It consists of three theologians, (Friedrich, Michelis, and Reusch,) two professors of canon law, (Maassen and Schulte,) and two other laymen. Another committee, of which Professor Dollinger is the chairman, and which has the right of co-operation, is to enter into communication with other Christian Churches about a reunion of the different branches of Christianity. And, with regard to this point, it was emphatically declared that the Old Catholics of Germany looked for a closer union not only with the Anglican and Greek Churches, with which they agree in most points of doctrines and of constitution, but also with the evangelical Protestants.

The Congress next discussed and adopted a series of resolutions relative to the legal condition of the Old Catholics. These resolutions demand that the State Governments recognize the Old Catholics as the sole representatives of the Catholic Church of Germany, because they alone professed the principle of the Catholic Church as it existed up to 1870, and as it had regulated its affairs by agreement with the State. They therefore demand the legal recognition of the Old Catholic bishops and priests by the State, and the payment of their salaries by the State, in accordance with the existing laws. They announce that the Old Catholics intend to establish before the German courts their claims to the property of the Catholic Church. They also represent the general introduction of the obligatory civil marriage as absolutely necessary.

For the present management and the further extension of the Old Catholic movement two central committees were appointed, one at Cologne for northern, and one at Munich for southern Germany. Switzerland already has a central committee of its own, and another will be appointed for the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

The most important work of the Congress is undoubtedly the provision for the appointment of one or several bishops, which will take place in the course of the coming year. Then only it can be found out whether the new Church has vitality enough to grow.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

The rupture between the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople and the Bulgarian nation (see "*Methodist Quarterly Review*," 1872, p. 329) became complete by the election, in March, 1872, of Bishop Anthim as Exarch, or head of the national Bulgarian Church. The Exarch at once made efforts to bring about an understanding with the Patriarch. The latter replied that he would give a respite of forty days, after the lapse of which he must return to the orthodox Church, and during which he must abstain from exercising any episcopal function, under penalty of

the canonical law. The Exarch indeed abstained from all ecclesiastical functions, although the Passover of the Greek Church took place within this period. But in the latter part of May the Exarch yielded to the pressure brought upon him by the leaders of the national Bulgarian party, and solemnly released the three Bulgarian bishops who, in January, 1872, had been excommunicated by the Patriarch, from the excommunication. This induced the Patriarch to convoke a meeting of his synod and of many prominent laymen, which declared the negotiations with the Bulgarians to be at an end, and Anthim to have incurred the canonical censures. On the other side, the Exarch, on May 24, left out in the liturgy the prescribed mention of the Patriarch, and substituted for it the words "the orthodox episcopate," which immediately called forth the reading of a pastoral letter by the Patriarch, excommunicating Anthim, and pronouncing the great anathema against the three Bulgarian bishops. Notwithstanding these measures, the Bulgarian Church consolidated itself more and more. The Exarch soon consecrated a new bishop, and at Wodina, in Macedonia, the Bulgarians expelled the Greek bishop, and declared that, in accordance with Article X of the firman establishing the Bulgarian exarchate, (by which article it is provided that two thirds of the inhabitants of a diocese have the power of demanding the connection of the diocese with the exarchate,) they would join the Bulgarian Church. On September 10 the "Great Synod" of the Church met in Constantinople. All the Patriarchs and twenty-five archbishops and bishops were present. The Synod soon declared "phyletism," that is, the distinction of races and nationalities within the Church of God, as contrary to the doctrine of the Gospel and of the Fathers, and excluded six Bulgarian bishops and all connected with the exarchate from the Church. All the bishops signed the decree except the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who left the Synod before its close, and was therefor insulted by the Greek population of Smyrna, in Asia Minor, who received him with shouts of "Traitor!" "Muscovite!" The following is a translation of the decree of the Synod, which will remain an important document in the annals of the Greek Church:

"Decree of the Holy and Grand Council, assembled at Constantinople in the month of September, in the year of grace 1872. The Apostle Paul has commanded us to take heed unto ourselves and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made us overseers, to govern the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood; and has at the same time predicted that grievous wolves shall enter among us, not sparing the flock, and that of our own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them; and he has warned us to beware of such. We have learned with astonishment and pain that such men have lately appeared among the Bulgarian people within the jurisdiction of the Holy Œcumenical Throne. They have dared to introduce into the Church the idea of phyletism, or the national Church, which is of the temporal life, and have established, in contempt of the sacred canon, an unauthorized and unprecedented Church assem-

bly, based upon the principle of the difference of races. Being inspired in accordance with our duty, by zeal for God and the wish to protect the pious Bulgarian people against the spread of this evil, we have met in the name of our Saviour Jesus Christ. Having first besought from the depths of our hearts the grace of the Father of light, and consulted the Gospel of Christ, in which all treasures of wisdom are hidden, and having examined the principles of phyletism with reference to the precepts of the Gospel and the temporal constitution of the Church of God, we have found it not only foreign, but in enmity to them, and have perceived that the unlawful acts committed by the aforesaid unauthorized phyletismal assembly, as they were severally recited to us, are one and all condemned.

“Therefore, in view of the sacred canons, whose rulings are hereby confirmed in their whole compass; in view of the teachings of the apostles, through whom the Holy Ghost has spoken; in view of the decrees of the seven Œcumenical Councils, and of all the local councils; in view of the definitions of the Fathers of the Church, we ordain as follows: ART. 1. We censure, condemn, and declare contrary to the teachings of the Gospel and the sacred canons of the holy Fathers the doctrine of phyletism, or of the difference of races and national diversity in the bosom of the Church of Christ. ART. 2. We declare the adherents of phyletism, who have had the boldness to set up an unlawful, unprecedented Church assembly upon such a principle, to be foreign and absolutely schismatic to the only holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. There are and remain, therefore, schismatic and foreign to the Orthodox Church the following lawless men who have of their own free will separated themselves from it, namely, Hilarion, ex-Bishop of Makariopolis; Panaretos, ex-Metropolitan of Philippopolis; Hilarion, ex-Bishop of Sostra; Anthimos, ex-Metropolitan of Widdin; Dorothea, ex-Metropolitan of Sophia; Partheonius, ex-Metropolitan of Nyssava; Gennadius, ex-Metropolitan of Melissa, before deposed and excommunicated; together with all who have been ordained by them to be archbishops, priests, and deacons; all persons, spiritual and worldly, who are in communion with them; all who act in co-operation with them; and all who accept as lawful and canonical their unholy blessings and ceremonies of worship. While we pronounce this synodal decision, we pray to the God of mercy, our Lord Jesus Christ, the head and founder of our faith, that he will preserve his holy Church from all dangerous new doctrines, and that he will keep it pure, spotless, and fast, on the foundations of the apostles and the prophets. We pray him to grant the grace of repentance to those who have separated themselves from her, and have founded their unauthorized Church assembly upon the principle of phyletism, so that they may some day nullify their acts, and return to the only holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, in order with all the orthodox to praise God, who came upon the earth to bring peace and good-will to all men. He it is whom we shall honor and worship, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, to the end of time. Amen.”

The decree is signed by his Grace the Œcumenical Patriarch and the three former Patriarchs, the Pontiff and Patriarch of Alexandria, the Patriarch of Antioch, the Archbishop of Cyprus, and by twenty-five metropolitans and bishops.

ART. VIII.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

A work by Professor Maassen, of Vienna, on the "History of the Sources and the Literature of the Canon Law in the West up to the End of the Middle Ages," (*Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechtes im Abendlande bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters*. Gratz, 1872,) is on all sides praised as a work of superior merit. The author, originally a Lutheran, joined some years ago the Roman Catholic Church, but is now one of the most gifted leaders of the Old Catholic movement.

Another prominent leader of the Old Catholics, Professor Lutterbeck, of the University of Giessen, has, in a monograph on The Clementines, (*Die Clementinen*. Giessen, 1872,) a book falsely ascribed to Bishop Clement, of Rome, undertaken to prove that the doctrine of infallibility, as well as that of the absolute power now claimed by the Popes, had its origin in this book, which, in the author's opinion, was compiled about the year 135. Heretofore most writers have regarded the second half of the second century as the time in which this book originated. Its spurious character is now almost universally admitted; only among the Ultramontane writers of Italy, France, and other Papal countries, there are occasionally found writers who have not heard of the modern investigations.

The Lutheran theologians of Germany continue to discuss the question of a Millennium. The millennial hope that the Jews, according to the biblical prophecies, will finally be converted and will be again gathered in Palestine, when, by the second appearance of Christ, they will be delivered from the hands of their enemies and establish a theocratic rule over all nations, has found a new champion in the Rev. A. Koch, (*Das Tausendjährige Reich*. Basel, 1872.) The author endeavors, in particular, to refute the arguments adduced against the doctrine of a Millennium by Hengstenberg, Keil, and Klieforth.

An important exegetical work on the Gospel of Mark and its relation to Matthew and Luke has been published by Prof. Weiss, (*Das Marcus evangelium und seine synoptischen Parallelen*. Berlin, 1872.) The author undertakes to prove that the Gospel of Mark was written before Matthew and Luke, but that prior to any of the three Gospels in their present form there was a brief record of the sermons of Jesus and of historical narratives, which Papias attributes to Matthew.

The work of Professor Köstlin on "The Doctrine of the Christian

Church according to the New Testament, and with Particular Reference to the Points Controverted between Protestants and Roman Catholics," has recently appeared in a second edition, (*Das Wesen der Kirche*. Gotha, 1872.) A point of special interest in this new edition is the discussion of the doctrinal bearing of the recent events in the Roman Catholic Church, and, in particular, of the views advanced in the addresses of Dr. Dollinger on the reunion of the Christian Church.

The highly-valued edition of the apologetic writers of the second century of the Christian Church, by Professor Otto, of Vienna, has been completed by the appearance of the ninth volume, (*Corpus Apologetarum christianorum sæculi secundi*, vol. ix. Jena, 1872.) This last volume contains the work of Hermias against the pagan philosophers and writings and fragments of writings of the Athenian Quadratus, of Aristides, of Aristo of Pella, of Melito of Sardes, and of Claudius Apollinaris.

Our knowledge of the ancient history of the Jews has been so much enriched by the discoveries of the Assyrian inscriptions that a special work on the relations of these discoveries to the Old Testament was highly needed. No more competent man could have undertaken to write on this subject than Dr. Schrader, Professor of Theology at Jena, (formerly of Giessen,) whose new work, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, ("The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament," Giesesen, 1872,) supplies all the information which those interested in the subject can desire. Professor Schrader is favorably known as a writer on the subject, and has in particular published a number of valuable articles in the *Studien und Kritiken*, to which the *Methodist Quarterly Review* has several times called attention. In the above work the author discusses all the passages of the Old Testament which are elucidated or explained by the cuneiform inscriptions, and then undertakes to establish a system of Hebrew and Assyrian chronology. Several appendixes give lists of Assyrian rulers, lists of administrations, a glossary of Assyrian words, and other interesting matter; and the use of the work is greatly facilitated by accurate registers, the key to the new chronological information which has been gathered from the Assyrian inscriptions to the discovery of the so-called "lists of Eponyms." Eponyms is the name which has been chosen for designating an officer in Nineveh who was elected annually, and who gave the name to the current year; every important occurrence of the year, as the wars and victories of the kings, the accession to the throne, the contracts of the merchants, etc., being called after him. On account of their similarity with the Athenian Archontes, they are also sometimes called Archontes. Now, of these Eponyms or Archontes we have complete lists from 900 to 600 B. C.; and as a tablet of king Sardanapal IV. fixes the year of the Eponym Puresalche (under whose successor king Tiglath-pileser succeeded to the throne) by means of a solar eclipse which astronomers have shown to have taken place on June 15, 763 B. C., we have for the whole series of Eponyms, as well as for the kings whose names are mentioned in their lists, dates which are indisputably correct. It is apparent of what immense signifi-

cance these discoveries must be for the establishment of a correct chronology of the Old Testament. It may still be mentioned that the reading of the Assyrian texts is now regarded by Orientalists generally as being almost completely certain. Besides the former Assyrian grammars by Oppert and Ménant, we have now a work, regarded as exhaustive, by Professor Schrader, entitled *Die Assyrisch-babylonischen Keilinschriften*, ("The Assyro-Babylonian Cuneiform Inscriptions—Critical Researches on the Bases of their Deciphering; together with the Babylonian Text of the Trilingual Inscription, with a Translation and Glossary." Leipsic, 1872.)

A new manual of pedagogics, (*Allgemeine Pädagogik*. Vienna, 1872,) by Dr. E. Böhl, professor of the Faculty of Evangelical Theology at Vienna, is generally designated as a very interesting contribution to the educational literature of Germany.

The comprehensive work on Church Law (*Kirchenrecht*, vol. vii. Ratisbon, 1872,) by Professor Georg Philips, of Vienna, has, soon after the appearance of the seventh volume, been interrupted by the death of its author, which occurred on September 6, 1872, at Aigen, near Salzburg. Professor Philips, born in 1804, was the son of an English merchant at Königsberg; became, in 1826, professor at the University of Berlin; joined, in 1828, the Roman Catholic Church; accepted, in 1833, a call to the Catholic University of Munich, and was rector of that University when the notorious Lola Montez caused the overthrow of the Catholic ministry and the dismissal of eight Catholic professors of the University, of which he himself was one. In 1848 he was a member of the German Parliament of Frankfort; in 1849 he became professor of the Austrian University of Innsbruck, and in 1851 of that of Vienna. Soon after he was also appointed Aulic Counselor (Hofrath) and member of the Academy of Sciences. He was regarded as one of the leaders of the Ultramontane party, and was several times chosen president of the annual meetings of the Catholic associations of Germany.

A very thorough and instructive monograph on the "Doctrine of the Logos in Greek Philosophy" (*Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie*. Oldenburg, 1872) has been published by M. Henze. The author traces the history of this important doctrine from its author, the pantheistic Heraclitus, of Ephesus, through the systems of Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics, to the Apocrypha of the Old Testament and Philo, and concludes with the opinions of Neo-Platonism. The historical development of the doctrine of the Logos in Christian theology the author leaves to theologians.

FRANCE.

The most important work of the Syriac literature, the ecclesiastical chronicles of Barhebraeus, is now being published in Brussels by J. B. Abbeloos and Th. J. Lamy, (*Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon eccles.* Brussels, 1872.) The edition contains, besides the Syriac text, a Latin trans-

lation. At the same time the grammatical works of Barhebraeus have been published at Paris by Abbé Martin, (*Œuvres gramm. de Barhebraeus*. 2 vols. Paris, 1872.)

One of the most prominent men of the Reformed Church of France, Eugene Bersier, has published a history of the General Synod of his Church which was held last year to take up again, after an interruption of two hundred and twelve years, the work of the former Synods of the Church, (*Histoire du Synode Générale de l'Eglise Reformée de France*. Paris, 1872.) The book contains a historical introduction which acquaints the reader with the past history of the Reformed Church, and with the causes which have produced the present situation of French Protestantism; the public proceedings of the Synod, with all the speeches made; an appendix, containing a collection of important documents relative to the history of the Church, such as the Confession of Faith of La Rochelle, the Discipline of the Reformed Church, the important Laws of 1802 and 1852, and the circulars of the Government explaining them; a brief summary of the history and the decisions of former Synods, the statistics of the Protestant population of France, a statistical account of the limits into which the Church is divided, the draft of the new Organical Law which has been adopted by the Synod, and much other important and interesting matter.

ITALY.

The papal almanac, which formerly was entitled *Annuario Pontificio*, has been published for 1872 under the title *La Gerarchia cattolica e la famiglia pontificia*. This almanac was formerly regarded as a kind of official publication of the Pope, and Catholic periodicals did, therefore, not dare to find fault with it. This year the compiler, Monsignor Ciccolini, appears to indicate in his preface that the almanac is not to be considered as official; and even the Catholic papers do, therefore, admit that the almanac leaves much to be desired, both in point of completeness and in point of accuracy. The almanac, in fact, contains nothing but a list of the cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and other high dignitaries of the Catholic Church and of the papal court. It contains no statistical information on the present number of Roman Catholics.

The public addresses which Pope Pius IX. has made since September 20, 1870, (the downfall of the temporal power,) have been published under the name *Discorsi del Sommo Pontefice Pio IX.*, ("Discourses of the Supreme Pontiff, Pius IX., Pronounced in the Vatican to the Faithful of Rome and of the Earth, from the Beginning of his Imprisonment until the Present Day. Collected for the first time, and published by P. Don Pasquale de Francisca." Rome, 1872.) A collection like this has a certain interest for the Church history of our age, for it is a faithful mirror of the sentiments animating the papal court at one of the greatest crises in the history of the Roman Catholic Church.

Professor M. Haug, of Munich, the best authority on all subjects relating to the religion of the Parsees, has published an essay on the "Ahuna-vairya Formula, the Holiest Prayer of the Zoroastrians," (*Die Ahuna-vairya-Formel*. Munich, 1872.) This prayer, which consists of hardly twenty words, is described as the eternal word of Ahuramazda, which existed before all creation, by which the world was created, and which is the substance of all good powers, terrestrial and spiritual. As to the meaning of the formula, the writers on the Zend language are not fully agreed. The translation which is given by Professor Haug (who for many years lived in India in literary intercourse with the Parsees) materially differs from one recently given by Professor R. Roth in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. xxv, pp. 14-21. According to Haug, the chief aim of the formula is to inculcate to every Zoroastrian the necessity of spiritual assistance and spiritual direction. The formula very frequently occurs in the sacred writings of the Parsees, and in the entire religious literature of the Zoroastrians. As the most powerful prayer, as the most effective magic formula, it is used in all occurrences of life, even in many of the most common occupations, but chiefly in religious ceremonies and performances. Thus it is used one hundred and twenty-one times in the libation of the consecrated wine and the consecrated fruit.

Among the great number of books and pamphlets which have recently been published on the present relation of the Roman Catholic Church to the State Government, one by Gerlach on "Pope and Emperor" (*Kaiser und Papst*. Berlin, 1872) attracts considerable attention because the aged author has long been one of the leaders of the High Church conservatism of Prussia. He is one of the very few Protestant writers who assert that the proclamation of the infallibility and absolute power of the Popes by the Vatican Council should neither affect the friendly relations between the State Government and the Papal Court, nor the alliance between High Church Protestants and Romanists against the liberal tendencies of the age.

ART. IX.—QUARTERLY BOOK TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

A Theodicy; or, Vindication of the Divine Glory, as Manifested in the Constitution and Government of the Moral World. By ALBERT TAYLOR BLEDSOE, LL.D. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

This "Theodicy" was written when the author was in the strength and ambition of his earlier manhood. His moral nature had not been put to the strain by advocating an institution the reverse of freedom, nor his feelings embittered by overwhelming disaster in his advocacy. The work is, therefore, manly and courteous in its spirit; pure, clear, and stately in its diction; richly freighted with

an immense amount of reading of the grand old masters of moral thought; and penetrative, demonstrative, and, in a great degree, original in the structure of its great argument. It will long stand, we trust, as a stronghold of a true theology; it never will be or can be fairly answered. To the large, but we fear not increasing, number of our ministry and laity who possess an interest in mastering the philosophy of our theology we cheerfully recommend the thorough study of our New Edition of this work.

To sustain its title for originality it is not necessary to claim that its fundamental positions are original. In a modest passage of his Introduction he says: "We do not wish to be understood as laying claim to the discovery of any great truth, or any new principle. Yet we do trust that we have attained to a clear and precise statement of old truths. And these truths, thus clearly defined, we trust that we have seized with a firm grasp, and carried as lights through the dark places of theology, so as to expel thence the errors and delusions by which its glory has been obscured. Moreover, if we have not succeeded, nor even attempted to succeed, in solving any mysteries, properly so called, yet may we have removed certain apparent contradictions, which have been usually deemed insuperable to the human mind." All this, and more, may be rightly accorded to the author. Yet on the other hand, in answering the objection (which no Methodist would bring) that he has presented a "new theology" he somehow admits and justifies. His truer and more conclusive reply would have been that as a structural "theology" there is nothing "new" about it. And so when he claims (p. 244) that Arminians are ignorant of the key-principle of his Argument, he claims what no well-read Arminian will ever concede to his work. It is simply a restatement of the old Chrysostomian-Arminian theodicy, embraced within the theology of the entire Eastern Church, of a large majority of the Western Church, and, in fact, of the entire Christian Church of the first three centuries. There is not a leading idea in this work by the side of which we might not place its duplicate in some preceding author, and, probably, many authors.*

* In noticing our refutation of Dr. Bledsoe's three charges against us individually of having plagiarized his Theodicy, the editor of the "Canada Christian Guardian" conceded the validity of our replies; yet he was pleased to add (we quote from memory, but, we think, correctly) that, in his opinion, we had not done sufficient justice to Dr. Bledsoe; that his own opinion of the Theodicy was higher than ours, and that he had himself received great benefit from its perusal. How the respected editor should know that our opinion of the work was lower than his he would be nonplussed to tell, as we have heretofore published no opinion of it

The work is divided into two parts. Part First seeks to reconcile the Existence of Sin, and Part Second the Existence of Suffering, with the Holiness of God. For the entire series of solutions through both parts, one great leading principle, firmly grasped and persistently applied, serves as the *key*. That key-principle is *the impossibility of a necessitated holiness*. In the very nature of things, holiness is the attribute of a free-agent. The non-existence of the freedom is the non-existence of the holiness. The production of a system of purely holy agents without the attribute of a non-necessitated free-agency is as impossible, even to Omnipotence, as a system of circles without the equality of the radii. This single key-principle unlocks a whole series of iron doors of the stern stronghold of Necessity. It enables us to emerge into the sphere of a genuine free-agency, in which the universe, though abounding in sin and suffering, is still seen as the best possible system, and as ruled by a perfectly wise and holy God.

Yet, as we have frankly said in our work on *The Will*, the terms in which this key-formula is expressed appear to us in an important point inaccurate. In the list of noble authors quoted in the work no Wesleyan-Arminian writer appears. This is deeply to be regretted. Theodicy, as included in theology, was really the field of that notable controversy which called forth those memorable expositions by Wesley, Fletcher, and others, to which the central part of Watson's *Institutes* was a grand addition. Theodicy in its connection with the other parts of theology was never so clearly, evangelically, practically, and conclusively developed as by these great Wesleyan masters. The author of this Theodicy would have

whatever. The work has never been before us for characterization; not in our *Quarterly*, for it has never before presented itself to us for notice; not in our "*Will*," for no author whatever, excepting Edwards in the Preface, is characterized in that work any more than in Dr. Bledsoe's own book. If the editor has derived benefit from its perusal, that rendered it his duty to do it justice, not ours, who owed it no obligations. And that we owed it no obligations is conclusively conceded by the editor when he admits that Dr. Bledsoe has picked his three test passages to prove our indebtedness, and has failed. How, then, are we called upon to do justice when we have incurred no obligation? We have ever in private intercourse recommended the work; and at the time the courteous editor of "*The Guardian*" was writing, our own copy was lent to a young minister to whom we had strongly advised its study. We may add that while Dr. Bledsoe was preparing his broadsides upon us personally we were doing our best to urge the issue of this New Edition. The idea that we should undertake to plagiarize a standard work, published at our Book Room, preposterously imputes to us an attempt to steal a man's property not only before his own eyes in open day, but also before the eyes of the public. Next to the stupidity of committing such an act is the stupidity of imputing it.

perhaps been saved from some mistakes, even if he had lost some of both his toil and his consciousness of origination. At least he would have escaped the sad mistake of claiming that any point in our theology was his own invention, and charging any one who had occasion to state that point with "stealing my thunder." Wesleyan-Arminian theology does claim that there may be a necessary innocence, rectitude, and holiness, as well as a necessary wickedness and depravity. The holiness received by Adam from his Creator was necessarily received. The depravity of the born infant is to him a necessary depravity. It requires a "gracious ability," derived from a system of supernatural grace, to enable man to emerge from its necessitating power. The formula of this Theodicy, though indicating the true key-principle, does not accurately express it in accordance with Wesleyan Arminianism. What the true formula is we have stated and illustrated on pages 375-396 of our volume on *The Will*. The true statement is, that there can be no necessitated guilt, or desert, and so no just reward or penalty, or proper divine government. That the true formula is correctly stated four or five times in fifty in the Theodicy does not mend the matter. To state it once falsely—as it is stated an immense number of times—is to state a falsity. To state both ways, and rightly by accident, simply demonstrates an unconsciousness of the exact nature of the formula required. With this due correction, the power of the argument, and the ability with which it is persistently put through by Dr. Bledsoe, remain the same. The whole is well worthy the attentive study and complete acquirement of the young theologian.

The able author also advances the doctrine that freedom to evil is necessary to freedom to the good, (p. 195.) Now Methodist theology holds that a man may be free to an immense variety of alternatives within the field of good alone. Without the ability derived through the atonement, man is free also to boundless varieties of volition within the domain of evil alone. Dr. Bledsoe's view plainly contradicts our Eighth Article of Faith, which declares that by the Fall man is free to evil only. Dr. Fisk in his very able "Calvinistic Controversy" uses the proposition that man may be free to one alone of the two as a key-principle to refute a whole series of fallacies in New England Calvinism. The true proposition—and it is one which Dr. B. would doubtless indorse—is, that power both ways, to good and to evil, is necessary (unless willfully forfeited) to responsibility, guilt, merit, reward, or punishment, and, so, is the condition of a just moral government. The

very fact that such a power is recognized by our theology as requisite to the existence of guilt as lying at the basis of a just divine government, is the very fact that requires our doctrine of a "gracious ability." The doctrine that there can be guilt in an agent who was never capable of right, is a contradiction not only to our theology, but to human intuition. The man who asserts it ought to be ready to affirm that there can be a square without a right-angle in it.

The same key-principle is used, with great skill and power, in unlocking the problem of the eternity of human punishment. The damned are those who cannot be made holy without necessitating their holiness; and that is a contradiction, and so not within the range even of Omnipotence. Our author did not originate the principle, nor its application. Archbishop King suggests the ground that the damned prefer their hell to heaven.* Swedenborg has elaborated the same principle into a splendid envisioned system† Yet nowhere is the principle wrought out in logic, and within the limits of orthodoxy, so clearly, through its many ramifications, as in this volume. So far as we can recollect, this view is unmentioned, and, apparently, unknown, in our earlier Methodist theology. The eternity, both of the bliss and the woe, of future retribution, is founded, in our standards, not on a volitional certainty, but upon an absolute impossibility of change. Yet for long years we have known the eternity of punishment based, in our pulpits, on the eternity of willful sinning. We suspect, too, that this part of this Theodicy has made a serious impression, extensively, upon the mind of our deep thinkers. Will there not, however, arise therefrom a tendency to the adoption of Stier's view of the limitation of eternal misery to those who have sinned against the Holy Ghost?

The Appendix, now first added to the present volume, is so balanced by excellences and drawbacks that we doubt whether the writer's best friends would have very peremptorily advised its insertion. Especially does the contrast in courtesy and dignity

* See his "Origin of Evil," p. 309, in which he suggests that "The Damned choose their miserable State, as Lovers, angry, ambitious, envious Persons indulge themselves in those things which increase their Misery." The drunkard strikes us as the best instance.

† Wilkinson, in his *Life of Swedenborg*, claims that Swedenborg's solution of Hell is a triumph over all previous conceptions, whether of Homer, Virgil, Dante, or Milton. The damned are inspired with an inverted ambition downward. They aspire deeper and deeper down the bottomless abyss, shooting eternally, with an ever increasing intensity, downward, until the skies are forgotten.

between the Theodicy and the Appendix suggest that the writer's mind has been embittered in the sad interval of years between the two writings. An objurgatory sub-tone underlying the whole, and sometimes "erupting" volcanically above the surface, tires the reader, and he begins to feel as if he were listening to a testy man. The writer of a sophistical article against his Theodicy in the "Southern Presbyterian Review," Dr. Boccock, is bountifully scolded, and the following is a specimen of the exclamatory style: "Yet has our most infallible and omnipotent critic set forth the whole of this vindication in one short sentence! Great man! Wonderful genius! Surely he could easily put the ocean in an egg-shell, or construct a palace with a single pebble! Let us see, then, how the poor 'Theodicy' is made to hide its diminished head in a single sentence." Dr. B. seems to aim at a clean field in Arminian Theodicy by annihilating both foes and friends: foes, because he can endure no contradiction from gainsayers; and friends, because he can "bear, like the Turk, no brother near the throne." But it is our unchangeable opinion that the challenge contained in the following two sentences cannot be safely accepted: "It is certainly easy to misrepresent and ridicule my 'Theodicy,' if we may judge from the habit of its Calvinistic adversaries. But who, or where, is the adversary by whom its foundations have been shaken?"

Humanity Immortal; or, Man Tried, Fallen, and Redeemed. By LAURENS P. HICKOK, D.D., LL.D. 8vo., pp. 362. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1872.

Dr. Hickok, in his "Creator and Creation," to which the present volume furnishes a proper complement, announced the purpose, here executed, of tracing the history of man from his beginning, through his trial, fall, redemption, and resurrection, to his eternal state. The guides in the investigation are the speculative reason, Holy Scripture, and the records of past ages, so far as they bear upon the case. The author assumes at the outset the theory of Life propounded in the former work. It lies at the basis of the whole discussion. To the conscious sentient life of the animal kingdom reason is supernaturally added in man, constituting a new and spiritual kingdom. The former lasts only so long as the nervous organism holds together, while in man the rational spirit secures immortality and perpetual intelligence, with a capacity for moral character, and it furthermore immortalizes its own sentient soul and all the essential forces in human individuality. Nature knows nothing higher than the gratification of sense; but the

crown of reason gives man control of nature, and points to the subordination of all sense-appetite to spiritual integrity as the condition of virtue.

Soon or late the character for virtue must be tested, and that from the necessity of the case, and not from the arbitrary will of the Creator. To this primitive trial of humanity the first chapter is devoted. The two opposite principles of sense and spirit existing in the constitution are certain to come into conflict, and that will be the hour for self-conquest or shame. There is greater danger to man in allowing the occasion of the first trial to fortuitously present itself, than there is if God shall himself arrange it. The principles necessarily directing in the trial Dr. Hickok sums up as follows: "(1.) Integrity of character is in the control of sense by the spirit. (2.) The trial must be imposed at the very outset. (3.) The test must put the sense and spirit squarely in conflict. (4.) The destruction in subjecting the spirit to the flesh should be plainly announced. (5.) The capabilities for an eternal state of bliss can be attained only in passing the hazard of such a trial." The Mosaic account shows these principles to have been applied to the case in hand. The result we know. Man fixed his own disposition in the end of self-gratification instead of the supremacy of the reason. Conscience became subordinate to appetite, spirit to sense, the *πνεῦμα* to the *ψυχή*. His sin was wholly of his own origination, and from it there is no self-recovery. The enslaved spirit has not power to burst its bonds. Man's disposition toward God was changed, as was God's toward him.

The second chapter describes humanity awaiting redemption. The tri-personality of the Godhead, or, as Dr. Hickok puts it, the "threefold conscious voluntariness in absolute reason," visible in creation and in governmental administration, is equally manifest in the work of redemption. The Logos, who will become incarnate when the fallen and deeply degraded race is prepared to receive and choose the only possible method of recovery, undertakes the task of its discipline and instruction. The history shows the wickedness of man to have been great, but the necessity of forty centuries of such an education as he gave the world exhibits, as nothing else can, the fearful depth of the fall. The flood, the ordination of capital punishment in protection against violence, the confusion of tongues at Babel, and the wonderful shortening of human life, were but successive special disciplinary providences for the curbing of depraved propensities. Then,

when the world's religion was becoming one of sensuality, it was found expedient to select one man whose posterity should be carefully trained to become a missionary nation to the race. And even then it was finally necessary to eliminate from the plan ten of the twelve Hebrew tribes, and with the other two pursue the work of preparation. The biblical account supplies the main facts for the hundred and thirty pages devoted to this portion of the history, but in the skillful hand of our author they are set forth with striking power. A fourfold result was attained: one nation was cured of pagan tendencies and brought to worship Jehovah alone; the idolatrous nations were made to recognize him as greater and more powerful than their own gods; the world was brought to expect the coming of One who would bring deliverance to sorrowing men; and many hearts were prepared to receive him and the spiritual truths which he might proclaim.

The presentation of the incarnation, work, and doctrine of the Redeemer is for the most part after the orthodox pattern, and vigorous and fresh, withal. The weightiest problems are firmly grasped. Now and then, indeed, the exposition trips, as when, for instance, we read, "So incarnated, Deity can be tempted," and "The devil promptly seized this first offered occasion for tempting Deity." It is bad enough to interpose the Godhead of Jesus as an impenetrable shield for his manhood against the force of temptation, but it is inconceivable that the Godhead should itself be the subject of attack.

Full redemption for all having been provided by the Logos according to the eternal ideas in the Father, it remained for the Holy Spirit to apply it in the conviction, conversion, and sanctification of men. The sections discussing the manner of his agency and the work which he accomplishes draw upon the strongest powers of the author, but he is not able to avoid the fearful collapse which befalls every attempt to combine "effectual calling" with universal redemption and human freedom. No amount of repetition and emphasis can obliterate the contradiction. Nor does the Spirit fulfill his office of applying the redemption, if he fails to give sufficient help for repentance to all for whom Christ died. A turning freely that is also a "secured" turning is but the turning of a machine. "Why not turn more? Why not save all?" become thus truly groveling questions. This, however, is the fault of the system, and not of Dr. Hickok. But we have not this apology for his adducing Paul's doctrine "that all, Jews and Gentiles, are under sin," and Solomon's well-worn

statement that "There is not a just man on earth that doeth good and sinneth not," to prove the completion of sanctification only at death; and still less for his Scripture argument for unconditional perseverance. We pass by several passages, torn and perverted from their logical connection, to the unscholarly reading of Heb. vi, 4-6: "It is impossible... if they shall fall away." Dr. Hickok is, or *ought* to be, sufficiently familiar with his Greek Testament to know that what our version so strangely interprets is aorist and not future, declarative and not conditional, and can only be translated, *and have fallen away*. Yet upon the false reading he builds a whole paragraph of argument, which, with the loss of its foundation, falls helpless to the ground. Instead of the "strongest expression of improbability," the passage is a statement of actual occurrence, doubtless within the knowledge of his readers, of Hebrew Christians who had abandoned Christ, and joined with Jews in denouncing him as an impostor.

The fifth and final chapter of the work, on last things in redemption, presents many thoughtful views, which we can only outline. In death the animal body drops off and dissolves, leaving the spirit and soul immortal but separated. The soul has its soul-body made up of "the substantial material forces that were the basis of the animal body," and the spirit has also its body, consisting of ethereal forces. Complete individuality is interrupted in death; the spirit, with the spirit-body, goes out in freedom into the ethereal universe, restricted only by its own moral disposition; while the sentient soul, with its soul-body, remains behind, unconscious but indestructible. In the resurrection the rational spirit finds its own sentient soul, the spiritual body unites with the psychical body by virtue of the energy of the spirit, thoroughly eliminating whatever may remain of the material that belongs only to the earthly life, thus making "the identical and individual personality which dwelt on the earth." The final judgment and the entrance upon the retributions of eternity finish the history proper, but the author takes us on to the end of the Mediatorial reign, when the Son will surrender the kingdom to the Father. Then, he thinks, the ends of the incarnation having been accomplished, the union of the divine and human in the person of Christ will be severed, and his humanity become, like all others, subject to God. The pages elaborating these views will richly compensate the reader, even though they may fail to carry conviction.

D. A. W.

Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects. By HENRY EDWARD. American edition. Volume I. 12mo., pp. 438. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1872.

Sermons on Living Subjects. By HORACE BUSHNELL. 12mo., pp. 468. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1872.

The sermons of Archbishop Manning, first-named above, are one of the many specimens of pulpit eloquence with which the Roman Church continues to adorn herself. The argumentative aim of each sermon, however clothed with fervid imagination, and expressed in semi-poetic diction, is never lost from view. One sermon paints the age of Thomas à Becket, when all power had floated to the hierarchy, in hues of rainbow radiance. Another sermon on "The Negro Mission," to our Southern blacks, makes humble confession of England's sin for sending slavery hither, but forgets all contrition for the sin of Romanism in doing its best to perpetuate slavery in America. The past political history of American Catholicism is a poor certificate for her to the American negro.

The sermons of the great pulpit thinker of Minnesota are in a different style. A series of sententious titles are but indexes of the deep wisdom unfolded in the productions they indicate. The brain of the great Congregationalist grows mightier with advancing years.

Discourses upon the Attributes of God. By STEPHEN CHARNOCK, B.D., Fellow of New College, Oxford. With his Life and Character. By WILLIAM SYMINGTON, D.D. Two volumes in one. 8vo., pp. 543. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1873.

Sermons and Discourses. By THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. Now Completed by the Introduction of his Posthumous Sermons. Two volumes in one. 8vo., pp. 473. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1873.

Charnock belongs to that class of old Puritan divines whose place is fixed, we suppose, beyond criticism. To us their works are magnificent structures of religious common-place. Subjectively, we catch not the slightest spark of inspiration from them, unless it be a powerful predisposition to somnolency. But, doubtless, there are others to whom they are a power, and to that cast of minds we abandon them.

Chalmers is a man whose reputation did not surpass his real greatness. His sermons were full of life and inspiring power. We hold him, as philosopher, theologian, and preacher, in intellect and grandeur of imagination the greatest mind the Scottish pulpit ever produced. Our objection to this edition is that its inferior material and avoidupois solidity give to the book a look of crude heaviness that belonged not to the man, and belong not to the splendid thought overspreading the dull-looking pages.

The Foot-Prints of Satan; or, The Devil in History, (the Counterpart of God in History.) By Rev. HOLLIS READ, A.M. 12mo., pp. 557. New York: E. B. Treat. 1872.

In a unique and trenchant form Mr. Read has arranged and arraigned the forces of Evil that now make war on the happiness of the world and the kingdom of Christ on earth. The various forms which Satanism puts on are analyzed and portrayed. The devil is detected in war, in intemperance, in the perversion of intellect, wealth, the press; and in false religions, of which Romanism is the specimen instance. Then comes the devil in man, arousing his lusts, desecrating the marriage relations, and spreading licentiousness, demoralization, disease, and death. The remedy for all is Christ's second coming, destroying the destroyer and ruling the world in person. Meanwhile the more immediate remedy, we think, is the waging moral battle with the weapons of truth and Christianity. Mr. Read's book may be recommended to the warriors in this battle as an armory of weapons.

From Atheism to Christianity. By Rev. GEORGE P. PORTER. 16mo., pp. 121. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1873.

Having made the transition, Mr. Porter proposes to show the route for others. He does this in a series of progressive chapters full of sententious suggestions. So paragraphic is he, so impatient of over-fullness, that the reader might scarce be able to make the series of leaps of inference did not the table of contents furnish a clear clue to the line of thought. Thinkers will analyze his ingots with pleasure. He shows that God, the living God, is the demand of the heart and soul of man. Given humanity as it is, and the God of our Bible is a necessity.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Allgemeine Pädagogik, (General Pedagogics.) von Dr. E. BÖHL. Wien: W. Braumüller. 1872.

Public schools are based on the assumption that pupils are numerical units of like capacities and wants. The assumption is only partially true. Pupils differ in many directions, and hence require different qualities in instruction and in instructors. But public schools are obviously indispensable. The question then arises, How can they be made most nearly to meet their end? How can their inevitable defectiveness be best complemented? The book before us is a conscientious endeavor to answer this question, and contains theoretical and practical views interesting

to teachers in all lands. The general positions of the author are these: Educative influencing should be an organic whole. All education that does not bear upon the whole destination of the pupil is dangerous. The end of education is not, as Rousseau taught, to make men out of Christians, but to make Christians out of men. Teachers can accomplish their work only in so far as they are genuine Christians. They must be of some positive religion, and all schools should be of some confessional type. No other profession requires such a thorough preparation. The fewer the pupils the greater the success of the teacher. He should be able to enter into sympathy with the peculiar wants—health, capacity, temperament—of each pupil. He should either be himself the parent, or at least stand in intimate relations to the parent. Children-schools are a modern pestilence. Until eleven or twelve years the child's vitality should go chiefly to building up its body. Until after this age the school should not seriously invade the family-life. The father is the sun and the mother the moon, and around these chief luminaries of the domestic firmament the children and servants should revolve as planets, each obedient in its proper orbit. But this divinely-ordered state of things is getting sadly interrupted. The school has largely arrogated to itself the functions of the family. Not only so, but it is slaughtering the innocents by thousands. On an average, one third of the volunteers for the Prussian army have to be rejected as physically incapable. The exhausting iron-rule of the school-system is the cause. There is need here of reform. Ideal education is where the teacher is a perfect Christian, and where his influence comes in only as a complement to that of the parent.

The pedagogies of Dr. Böhl would not injure American pedagogues. Are not also our public schools verging on a pernicious system of secularism and high pressure?

Weltelend und Weltschmerz, (World-woe and World-wail,) *eine Rede*. von JURGEN BONA MEYER. Bonn: Adolph Marcus. 1872.*

Professor Meyer, formerly of Berlin, now of Bonn, is one of the most genial and wide-awake philosophical *dilettanti* of the day. He has recently published a volume of twelve lectures, in which he discusses, in clear popular style, and from a healthy moral stand-point, the most knotty "Philosophical Questions of the Day." The essay on *Weltelend und Weltschmerz* is an able refutation of the chief sophisms of the *pessimism* of Schopenhauer

* This department of foreign Book Notices is mostly furnished by Prof. Lacroix.

and Hartmann. The position of Schopenhauer was: All existence rests upon a willing to exist; now, willing is desiring, and desiring presupposes a want; but every want conditions a suffering; hence suffering is involved in all willing. Only suffering, unpleasure, is positive; all joy, pleasure, is negative, is simply the absence of misery. Man is the neediest of all sentient creatures. As his walking is but a constantly arrested falling, so is his life a constantly arrested dying, and so is all mental pleasure simply an incessantly repressed *ennui*. Human life is a business that does not cover the costs. The true wisdom lies in the *nirvana* of Indian Buddhism. With Schopenhauer essentially agrees Eduard Von Hartmann, in his "Philosophy of the Unconscious," save only that he does not contest the reality of some positive pleasure in life. Hartmann's method is empirical. He examines and sums up, on the one hand, all the various joys of life, and, on the other, all the ills to which flesh is heir; and then, balancing the one sum against the other, finds that the joy-quantum kicks the beam. He concludes that life in general is so sad that no reasonable man would choose to recommence and live his life over again, and that it is only the deceptive hope of a better life that makes us prefer life to death, existence to nonentity. Professor Meyer not only shows, step by step, the fallacies of these pessimists, but attempts to account for the fact that so large a circle of political and literary journals have recently overabounded in laudation of the views of Hartmann. Schopenhauer's thoughts began to take root only in the years 1840-50, when the miseries of the German people were at their acme. The chagrin following in the train of 1848 drove them into still deeper hopelessness, and thus made them receptive for a philosophy of despair. Hartmann met the want, hence his popularity. Mr. Meyer thinks that, now that Germany has risen from her political paralysis, the public will lose its relish for pessimism, and turn its regards to the sunnier fields of a sane philosophy.

Die Entstehung der menschlichen Sprache, etc. (The Origin of Human Speech, etc.) von Dr. WEBER. Heidelberg. 1871.

Professor Weber, of Freiburg, desired two years ago to signalize the fiftieth anniversary of his philosophical doctorate by the publication of a mature work on the harmony of physics, anthropology, and philosophy. Hindered by failing health from his full design, he is endeavoring to carry it out on some of the chief subordinate topics. The essay above named discusses man's place in nature and history, and the origin and development of human

speech. It is pervaded by sound views, and forms quite a contrast to the turn of thought now in vogue among a large class of scientists. Some of Professor Weber's positions are these: Mankind forms a separate natural kingdom; as separate as the animal, the vegetable, and the mineral kingdoms. To overlook this involves the naturalist in absurd consequences. Man, shut out from society, learns no language-proper; he rises, like the animal, only to mimic sounds and signs to express his sensations. Man becomes man only among men. Man is never an animal; were he so he would never become man. Metamorphoses of a limited character take place within each kingdom. Varieties arise within families. Genera, species, families may perish in telluric catastrophes, but are never changed into others. As little as a mineral can be changed into a plant, or a plant into an animal, so little can an animal become a man. It is astonishing that talented and versatile men, like Karl Vogt, can assume that man descends from the ape. It is only from a lack of philosophical training that such absurd views are to be accounted for. Essays such as this of Dr. Weber cannot fail of a happy influence.

Christliche Glaubenslehre vom Methodistischen Standpunkt. (Methodist Dogmatics.) von A. SULZBERGER, Dr. phil. Bremen: Tractathaus, Georgstrasse, 59.

That vigorous young offshoot of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Conference in Germany, is beginning to add intellectual to its spiritual fruitfulness. One of its sons gives us here the first installment of a system of Methodist Dogmatics. In Mr. Sulzberger's case the *Dr. phil.* is not an empty suffix. He came to it honestly, through sturdy work under great University lights. The work he has undertaken is greatly needed by our Church in Germany. As Dr. Sulzberger is a thorough Methodist in heart, and well versed in the requisite English as well as German sources, we have reason to hope that he will meet the demands of the case. He lays his work out on an ample scale, and begins it, in true German style, by laying the foundations broad and deep, and by abundantly fortifying them with the authority of precedent and great names. This "*heft*" of 189 pages contains only the Introduction (150 pages) and the Doctrine of God (39 pages). The Introduction gives evidence of thorough study, and contains (a) A characterization of dogmatics; (b) A discussion of the Scriptures as authority and norm; (c) A history of dogmatics; and, (d) The method of dogmatics. From a careful look into the work we are led earnestly to hope that the gifted young author may speedily bring it to completion.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Introduction to the Study of Biology. By H. ALLEYNE NICHOLSON, Professor of Natural History and Botany in University College, Toronto. 12mo., pp. 163. New York: Appleton & Co. 1872.

This little manual has received, as it deserves, high commendation from the English reviews. To those who desire a brief and clear introduction to the Science of Life and living nature, as it stands at the present hour, as free as possible from technicalities, and without the polemical spirit vitiating its discussions, can find no better horn-book. A series of momentous questions, to which the attention of the thoughtful public is intensely directed at the present time, is discussed with perfect calmness and great clearness. The Nature of *Life*, Protoplasm, the "Vital Force," are the topics of the first chapter. The Nature of Species, Elemental Cells, the wonderful phenomena of Reproduction, Spontaneous Generation, Origin of Species, Evolution, Creation, and Darwinism, form the topics of twelve chapters. The two closing chapters discuss the distribution of animals in space as embraced in Physical Geography, and their distribution in time as revealed in the strata of Geology.

On the topic of Protoplasm, or more properly, as Dr. Beale calls it, Bioplasm, he admits the true existence of a "physical basis of life," but exposes Huxley's stupid blunder in confounding the basis with the life itself. The basis is only a condition of the manifestation of life, as the conductor is the basis of the manifestation of electricity. But in neither case is the basis necessary to the existence of the element. Lightning exists without the conductor, and the life may exist without the bioplasm. And the phenomena of life cannot be *chemically* explained. There is an immense amount of cases in which the vital phenomena operate by overriding all known chemical forces and laws. These anti-chemical and super-chemical forces must provisionally, at least, be labeled as "vital forces." It is true, science has in past times been much advanced by rescuing to the domain of chemistry much that was once included in the domain of "vital force."

Our physiological brethren are greatly puzzled to find a definition of *Life*. Even Mr. Nicholson, after giving some specimens of definition furnished by some great scientists, which are hardly creditable to them as men of sense, to say nothing of science, fairly gives it up. To us it seems odd that they never look to the world of *mind*, nor ever recognize such a thing as intelligence, in their pursuit after a definition. As a psychologist, at any rate, we

have, or imagine we have, no difficulty—so far, at least, as psychology is concerned. Life we define as that state of organic matter which is necessary to its becoming the basis of intelligence. Or, more briefly, Life is the organic condition of thought. This, indeed, defines animal life alone; and rightly, for animal life is a different *thing* from vegetable life, and so the same description ought not to suit both. Vegetable life, if life it is to be called, is the organic condition of *the true growth process*. The animal shares the same *organic* life as the vegetable, with a higher thought-conditioning life; so that both animals and vegetables *grow*, and nothing else *does grow*. Neither a rolling snow-ball nor a crystal *grows*, but animals and plants alone do grow. Vegetable life, therefore, is *the organic condition of growth*, while animal life is *the organic condition of thought*.

How does a microscopist decide that a scarce visible animalcular particle is alive? In no other way than by its movements resembling those produced by volitions in larger animals. So that manifested volition after all is with him the *test* of life. But even the first faint gleam of sensation in a material particle would imply *life*. And this enables a psychologist, at any rate, to draw *in thought* the real distinction between animals and plants, which in their lowest orders become undistinguishable to the eye of the physiologist. The animal belongs, however dimly enlightened, to the intelligent world. And between intelligence and absolute unintelligence the difference is infinite. The faintest possible spark of sensation in the lowest animal being is *in nature* one with the highest intelligence, and belongs to the universe of mind overlying the universe of matter.

The Primeval Man: An Examination of some Recent Speculations. By the DUKE OF ARGYLL. 12mo., pp. 200. New York: Dewitt C. Lent & Co. 1872.

A handsome edition, essentially unaltered, of the Duke's book. It is in Three Parts. Part First contains some very conclusive arguments against Darwinism; Part Second concedes the reality of the geologic man, but, by sacrificing the Scripture chronology, still maintains the descent of the race from Adam, who existed untold ages ago; Part Third endeavors to show that primeval man, though unversed in science, possessed that clear balance of faculties which exempts him from being properly called a barbarian.

In the First Part the Duke, taking Huxley's concession that man's mental superiority to the brute is "practically infinite," unan-

swerably replies that, then, as by the materialist's own concession mind is the result of cerebral structure or substance, it follows that there must be a practically infinite superiority in man's brain over the highest brute brain. This at once silences all the talk about there being less difference in brain between lowest man and highest brute than between highest man and lowest man. The Duke justly condemns the claims of the present zoological classifications into species to present any true view of the nearness or distance to the brute of man's *being*, as a whole. The classifications are based on points which, though running through and comprehending large numbers of individuals, are really subordinate points. The point by which man is classified with bimanuals is an incident in man's nature; and even in that incident, namely, of the *hand*, man's superiority is measureless; but the main quality of man, his *mind*, is entirely shut out of view. Science may, of course, have her *way* and her *say*; but, then, her *say* says nothing whatever as to the entire man's real relations to brute. We do not go to Zoology to learn the true nature of man; for the *zoon* is the lowest part of man.

Argyll is very conclusive against Darwin on the geological argument. When Darwin is told that the pages of Geology furnish no minutely gradual advances of animal forms, he replies that we have but fragmentary scraps of the full geologic record, which truly extends through millions of millions of years. Had we the whole book, then you would see one pictured series of infinitesimal advances. To this Professor Thomson replies that Natural Philosophy refuses to allow more than one hundred millions of years. Argyll additionally replies that there are some strata of large extent in which there clearly is no break, and in which new races are seen to spring, with sudden completeness and in large numbers, into existence. These facts seem to exclude Darwinism from all *status*, even as a scientific *hypothesis*. The earliest human skull that geology has dug up belonged to a well-developed man. Nothing seems left us save the Old Bible doctrine of immediate creation.

After so victorious a battle with Darwinism we much regret that the Duke, in the Second Part, makes so easy a concession of the reality of the geologic man.

Should, however, the geologic man be demonstrated we could not accept the Duke's theory in behalf of Moses. We again say that we should by far prefer the views of Poole and M'Causland, of the derivation of man from different centers of creation. We

should then hold that there is a unity of the race, not in parentage, but in nature—in prolificacy and in Christ. Our reason is that the Duke's theory breaks the Scripture text and destroys the Messianic genealogy, while Poole's only revolutionizes our exegesis of a number of Scripture texts, yet without distributing the foundations of our evangelical theology. But the Duke's book is a model of pure and graceful English diction, and is well worth the perusal of every thinker interested in the subject.

The Science of Æsthetics; or, The Nature, Kinds, Laws, and Uses of Beauty. By HENRY N. DAY, Author of "Logic," "Art of Discourse," "English Literature," etc. 12mo., pp. 434. New Haven, Conn.: Charles C. Chatfield & Co. 1872.

Professor Day (of Yale College) has very skillfully shaped the treatment of Æsthetics into a systematic manual convenient for the ordinary student and reader, and admirably adapted for the purposes of recitation in our academies and colleges. If our crowded courses of study will admit a new insertion, this branch of scholarly accomplishment presents a very desirable addition. A due training of the mind in the principles of beauty improves the character and opens to the view new and boundless sources of a pleasure almost too high and pure to be called a "pleasure." There is also a wonderful occult relation between æsthetic and ethic. Cultivate the mind's eye with æsthetic truth, and traces of the divine are discerned in the system of creation, naturally rendering atheism repugnant to the feelings. And the elevating effects of the study are adverse to low materialism. The solution of the problem of the beautiful as presented by Professor Day enables us to feel that alike the world around us and the world within us, the macrocosm and the microcosm, are *spirit in matter*, and that there is a genuine sympathy and oneness between the divine in both worlds.

The work is symmetrically and exhaustively divided into Four Parts. The first ascertains the Nature of Beauty; that is, from a brief history of the various theories touching the true source of the beautiful in things, it decides and demonstrates the final and true view of beauty itself. The second classifies the Kinds of Beauty; that is, it traces in things the different sorts into which they may as beautiful be divided. Thence, third, a synthesis is given of the Laws of Beauty; for, after having learned what Beauty is, and what sorts and forms of it there are, we may proceed to ascertain under what principles we may decide upon what is beautiful, and how we can ourselves, discarding all the

ugly and spuriously beautiful, construct truly beautiful things. Thus we have drawn out the beauty that exists so as to enjoy it, and we have even learned ourselves how to create it. The fourth part treats the Relations of Beauty to other departments of thought, and the Uses of Beauty in its purifying, moralizing, and ennobling effects upon the character. It is rather an addendum to the system, which is complete in the previous three parts, but it possesses great practical value.

Certainly our public and private character as a people cannot be harmed by a leisurely and fuller study of the orderly and the becoming. Our great Republic excels in fierce energy, very liable to wreck were it not that our wonderful historic training in civil organization had so long preserved us. But what dangers surround us and lie in our future path! Next to Christianity and organizing law, quite valuable to us is a tranquilizing study, by a much enlarging class of minds, of the principles that form the basis of harmony and order. An ennobled, refined, and religious character is the sure basis of our future well-being. Natural science in the hands of scoffing materialists is dragging us downward; it is well that there is a higher science or two to draw us upward.

The Works of Rev. Robert Murray M'Cheyne. Complete in one volume. 12mo., pp. 518. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1873.

M'Cheyne, born in 1813 and dying in 1843, was a marvel of youthful talent, holiness, and intense devotion to the work of saving souls and extending the reign of truth and righteousness. He is well styled by the "Nashville Christian Advocate" the "Summerfield of Scotland." But, unlike Summerfield, he has left in his works, forming the large body of this volume, a monument of his genius well worthy the study of the ministry and the Church.

History, Biography, and Topography.

History of the Missions of the Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the Oriental Churches. By RUFUS ANDERSON, D.D., LL.D. In two volumes. 12mo., pp. 426, 532. Boston: Congregational Publishing Society. 1872.

Dr. Anderson's handsome volumes relate to us the history of the the American Missions to the cradle of Christianity and the cradle of the human race. It is a history of profound interest to every lover of missions and to every student of human progress. It extends from the year 1819, when those two pioneers of blessed memory, Pliny Fisk and Levi Par-

sons, first started on their tour of exploration. And we may say that the American Board seems ever to have been happy in the *personnel* of its missions. The holy men and women who consecrated themselves to this service were eminently faithful in their lives, and their deaths were often luminous with tokens of the divine presence. There seems to have been a timely providence in the awakening of the enterprise of missions for these regions simultaneously with those great changes by which modern civilization has been rolling its waves of light eastward. It was a matter of immense importance that the pure beams of the Gospel should blend with those influences. Paganism, Mohammedanism, and dead Christianity were ruling in the East, and wisely did the thoughtful planners of these missions understand that in order to the victory over the former two dead Christianity must first be brought to life. These blessed missionaries are to be claimed as the common property of the evangelic Church. Though given to this work by a denomination, they did not go to make Congregationalists or Presbyterians, but to vitalize, if possible, the ritualisms and hierarchisms they were to find with the power of godliness. Herein they were good Methodists; seeking to perform the very work which Wesley enterprised in his day, the quickening Churchianity into Christianity. And, like Wesley, they never withdrew from the hierarchy and organized a new system until it was clear that hierarchy knew not the day of its visitation. The toils and expenditures of the supporters of this great enterprise have not been in vain. They have planted many a luminous center amid the surrounding twilight, brightening the twilight into daylight. They have broken down the barriers of Mohammedan intolerance, and made the Oriental conscience free to inquire and to accept the Gospel. They have established the usual routine of a higher order of life—the pulpits, the schools, the periodicals, the libraries and the presses by which the atmosphere of that ancient land is made rife with evangelical influences. Our prayer and our trust may well be that in another half century the birthplace of our Christianity will be awakened to a new birth and life. We thank Dr. Anderson for these noble volumes.

A Western Pioneer; or, Incidents of the Life and Times of Rev. Alfred Brunson, A.M., D.D., Embracing a Period of over Seventy Years. Written by Himself. Vol. I. 8vo., pp. 418. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1872.

If the proportions of the present volume be carried out Dr. Brunson's portraiture will be as nearly "large as life" as that of

any personage in our Methodist history since Wesley. Some will object to its fullness of unimportant and ordinary details; but he assures us that he "has studied brevity notwithstanding its length;" had "every incident. . . been recorded, the work would have been greatly extended;" and that "no two incidents precisely alike are recorded."

As a summary of his services he says: "I have preached nearly, or quite, *ten thousand* times—I cannot say sermons, for many of them were often repeated, and improved by the repetition—and have been instrumental, under God, of saving at least *six thousand* souls; and though, mostly, my work has been on new and poor ground, I have aided, directly or indirectly, in building about *forty churches*."

As a picture of past times in the progress of Methodism and of our country, as furnishing testimony in regard to some important characters and events, and as a record of the services of any able and faithful "pioneer" in our aggressive movements, the volume will doubtless be welcome to a large body of readers.

*History of Methodism: Its Establishment and Extension into the Different Parts of the Earth. After the most Authentic Sources. By L. S. JACOBY. Volume I, British Methodism. Volume II, American Methodism. 12mo., paper covers, pp. 350, 476. Bremen: Office of the Tract House. 1870.**

Untoward circumstances have delayed first our receiving, and then our noticing, Dr. Jacoby's volumes in good time. We have read them with interest both as an excellent presentation of their subjects and a marked symbol of progress. They are written to present to German readers the proof that Methodism is a movement in which the divine Spirit was the moving power. Not human talent, nor a fortunate concurrence of circumstances, nor efficient machinery, nor even true doctrines, sufficed to solve the problem, though these were all present; but the Divine Presence in the wheels secured their revolving progress. His story is told with the clearness, plainness, and strong earnestness with which the German mind often grapples our "Christianity in earnest."

The first volume, after an introductory review of the anterior religious history and condition of England, traces the rise and progress of original Methodism through its different epochs. Six chapters carry us to the death of the Wesleys, and two chapters more to the death of Bunting. One chapter narrates the Irish,

* *Geschichte des Methodismus, seiner Entstehung und Ausbreitung in den verschiedenen Theilen der Erde. Nach authentischen Quellen bearbeitet. von L. S. Jacoby. Erster Theil, pp. 350. Zweiter Theil, pp. 476. Bremen: Verlag des Tractathauses. 1870.*

French, and Canadian Methodist history; and the three remaining chapters review the missionary organization, the ecclesiastical polity, and the literature of English Methodism.

The second volume presents the history of American Methodism, down to 1868, in eight chapters. Two chapters then review our literature and our missions. The eleventh chapter, forming, very properly, full one third of the volume, narrates the history of German Methodism, from its first dawn in the conversion of William Nast, through its spread in America and Fatherland, down to the date of publication. The founding and growth of our Theological Seminary under, successively, Professor Warren and Professor Hurst, are duly traced. The two final chapters describe our ecclesiastical organization, and furnish a summary of the doctrines of Methodism. This summary is given with great clearness and simplicity, mostly, indeed, in the translated words of Wesley himself. In the German part of our work Dr. Jacoby has been so leading a sharer that he was eminently fitted to be its historian. These volumes are admirably suited for circulation among German readers on both sides of the Atlantic; and Anglo-Americans readers of German may find a peculiar zest in seeing the story of Methodism told in the deep Teutonic brogue.

California for Health, Pleasure, and Residence. By CHARLES NORDHOFF, Author of "Cape Cod and All Along Shore," etc. 8vo., pp. 255. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

If you are going to visit California you will read Mr. Nordhoff's book as counselor and guide. If you cannot make a visit you can read the book as a substitute. Perhaps you may know more of California by the book without the visit than by the visit without the book. At any rate the author is a very natural well-aired traveler, who is sure to see what ought to be seen, and know what ought to be known, with a facile and hearty way of telling the whole, free from the effort to be ceaselessly brilliant. Whatever is picturesque for the sentimentalist, or paying for the emigrant, or hygienic for the invalid, is here unfolded in narrative, and, where possible, made visible in engraving. It is a grand surprise that the Almighty has wrought for us, that the richest and sweetest part of our continental heritage has but just opened before us. It opens as a rich reward for that free and glorious energy which has founded our republican system, preserved at the price of rivers of blood our nationality, and consummated our interoceanic railroad, prepared and bestowed by Infinite Goodness. It is, however, in our permanent character as a consistent and constitutional semi-

invalid, seldom sick and never well, that we have read this book with most interest. We were, for a while, enabled to live in rich imagination in the American Italy, superior to Italy herself, of Southern California, so refreshingly, that when we had finished, the irritation of our bronchials was so sensibly diminished that we concluded not to go.

A Journey to Egypt and the Holy Land in 1869-70. By HENRY M. HARMON, D.D., Professor of Ancient Languages and Literature in Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. 12mo., pp. 332. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1873.

Professor Harmon has taken the usual tour booked up by countless predecessors, and he states, himself, the question, "Why publish?" He indicates some originalities on some special points contained in his book. But the true reason is that every leading man has a circle, or a number of concentric circles, who from acquaintance and sympathy will see more freshly through his eyes, and may well be induced to look and learn what is new to them, though old to the rest of the reading world. The Professor is not, like some of his predecessors, sensationally witty, or picturesque, or sentimental. We do not remember a sentence that tries to be eloquent or poetical. *Things as they are*, with clear, strong prosaic perception, are presented, so that those who make his eyes their spy-glasses will be apt to see them as they are too.

Dr. J. J. I. von Döllinger's Fables respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages. Translated by ALFRED PLUMER, together with Dr. Döllinger's Essay on the Prophetic Spirit and the Prophecies of the Christian Era. Translated for the American Edition, with an Introduction and Notes, by HENRY B. SMITH, D.D. 12mo., pp. 463. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1872.

We turn to Döllinger in the field of investigation here selected as an ultimate authority. Was there ever really a female Pope Joan? How about the heresy of Pope Honorius? Did Huss truly predict the coming of Luther? Was Savonarola actually endowed with prophetic power? This venerable doctor has all the data in reach; he has the brain for ultimate investigation, and the honesty to tell the truth. He is far nearer to infallibility than the plump old gentleman with the three-storied cap down at the Vatican. Our learned papistical controversialists, from time immemorial down to Father Burke, have ever assumed one sure axiom of historical investigation, namely, whatever tells for the Church is true; whatever is adverse is "a Protestant lie."

Educational.

A Manual of American Literature. A Text-book for Schools and Colleges. By JOHN L. HART, LL.D., Professor of Rhetoric in the College of New Jersey. 12mo., pp. 641. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother. 1873.

This is one of a course of volumes intended to induct the scholar into a complete mastery of English and American literature, noticed with commendation in a former "Quarterly." The entire course is constructed on a plan somewhat original and attractive, and, although educational *use* is the true test of practicability, we should judge it from examination to be admirably adapted to the teacher's purposes. The present volume is the result of no little labor in collecting fresh materials for a complete summary of American literature. One original point in the work is that the author has discovered that theology belongs within the range of a nation's literature. Heretofore any mediocrity in poetry, novels, essays, and secular history has been "literature;" but an Edwards, a Barnes, or a Hodge, though master minds in the highest range of thought, have been excluded from that high domain. It is easy to find fault with details in so pioneer a volume. Some may doubt whether the continuance of the plan of grouping a set of writers under one prominent name is desirable in a presentation of *living* authors. Some may wonder why Andrew D. White, who can scarce be considered as an "author" at all, should be spread out to so disproportionate an extent. Methodists will miss the names of Wilbur Fisk, James Floy, and Edward Thomson. And the Church South claims that the book has been too exclusively a northern exposure. Dr. Hart thus finds himself an arbiter of fame, and doubtless knows how to interpret all grumblings into tributes to the dignity of his office and the importance of his work. One volume more, entitled "*A Short Course of Literature*," now in preparation, will complete his admirable series of five.

A German Reader to succeed the German Course. By GEORGE F. COMFORT, A.M. 12mo., pp. 432. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

A German Course adapted to use in Colleges, High-schools, and Academies. By GEORGE F. COMFORT, A.M. 12mo., pp. 498. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

The First German Reader, to succeed the "First Book in German." By GEORGE F. COMFORT, A.M. 12mo., pp. 99. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

A Manual of German Conversation, to succeed the German Course. By GEORGE F. COMFORT, A.M. 12mo., pp. 238. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

We bring together the volumes of German instruction books by Professor Comfort, the present able Professor of Modern Languages in the Syracuse University. The first of the volumes is

an improvement upon Ollendorf. The second is a series of selections from the most classic authors of Germany, accompanied with notes rich with suggestions in comparative philology. The third is a smaller book of simple lessons. The last is a series of conversations, with English translations, giving a wealth of words, phrases, and information for a traveler in Deutschland. Teachers and professors may find the whole course unrivaled for its purposes.

Literature and Fiction.

The Divine Tragedy. By HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW. 12mo., pp. 150. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1871.

The Pennsylvania Pilgrim, and other Poems. By JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER. 12mo., pp. 129. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1872.

The Masque of the Gods. By BAYARD TAYLOR. 12mo., pp. 48. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1872.

The poets have taken to making their profession of faith. BAYARD TAYLOR summons the leading deity of each past religion successively to the scenes, (Jehovah among them,) and makes a divine "Voice from space" pronounce upon the relative truth, and promise in the future the absolute truth. The Voice authenticates beauty as divine, and, as "God of Love," pronounces EMANUEL to be his "one begotten Son, in whom I am well pleased." Though not a confession of the full truth of the New Testament, the poem is reverent, Christian, hopeful, and wrought out with no little poetic power.

WHITTIER lays aside his clarion and takes up his pastoral reed to show that Quakerism down in Pennsylvania is as worthy a bard and a world-wide commemoration as Puritanism up in New England. Germantown is nobler double to Plymouth. Now we believe in the "inner light;" but the best glimpse we can get at its pure blaze tells us that what Germantown lacked and Plymouth possessed was *power*. This was why Wesley forsook the Moravians. His energetic soul, inspired by a bold, aggressive faith, abandoned the meek brethren to their quiet, and, we fear, too selfish watching the serene candle in the soul. Alas, their candle is dimming away into darkness! The candle ought sometimes to be a blazing torch, cutting the black midnight with its fiery sword, and lighting the way even, if it must be, through war and bloodshed, to truth and freedom.

Fluent and fluid LONGFELLOW has shown how near the Gospels are to poetry. It takes but a few transpositions and extra touches of his golden pen to do the homely evangelists into sweet rhythm. He believes, apparently, in them all, and in the Apostles' Creed

to boot. He can, doubtless, indorse the dying creed of the late assassinated Richardson: "There is a great comfort in believing that Jesus Christ was something more than man."

♦♦♦

Miscellaneous.

The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. In two volumes. Volume I. 12mo., pp. 638. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1873.

Mr. Froude's visit and lectures will give a special interest to this work.

University Series. No. IX. The Earth a Great Magnet. A Lecture delivered before the Yale Scientific Club, February 12, 1872. By ALFRED MANHALL MAYER, Ph.D., Professor of Physics in the Stevens Institute of Technology. 12mo., paper cover, pp. 74. New Haven, Conn.: C. C. Chatfield & Co. 1872.

Professor Mayer's Lecture, delivered in free, popular style, on one of the most interesting phases of science, is among the best of Mr. Chatfield's admirable "University Series."

The Psalms. By CARL BERNHARD MOLL, D.D. Translated from the German, with Additions, by Rev. CHARLES BRIGGS, Rev. JOHN FORSYTH, D.D., Rev. JAMES B. HAMMOND, and Rev. J. FRED. M'CURDY. Together with a New Version of the Psalms and Philological Notes, by Rev. THOMAS J. CONANT, D.D. 12mo., pp. 816. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1872.

Our brief examination induces us to believe that this is a very rich contribution to our literature on the Psalms.

Shakspeare's Comedy of the Merchant of Venice. Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M. With Engravings. 12mo., pp. 168. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Shakspeare's Tragedy of Julius Cæsar. Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M. With Engravings. 12mo., pp. 189. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Shakspeare's History of King Henry the Eighth. Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M. With Engravings. 12mo., pp. 210. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Shakspeare's Comedy of The Tempest. Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M. With Engravings. 12mo., pp. 148. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

A series of individual master-pieces of the great master, in neat form, and illustrated with valuable notes.

Water and Land. By JACOB ABBOTT. With numerous Engravings. 12mo., pp. 330. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

Light. By JACOB ABBOTT. With numerous Engravings. 12mo., pp. 313. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

Force. By JACOB ABBOTT. With numerous Engravings. 12mo., pp. 305. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1873.

In this series a very ingenious attempt is made at so blending some of the profoundest problems of science with a familiar narrative as to connect them with daily thought and life, catching the illustrations from constantly occurring objects. Individually we should prefer the science by itself; but there are thousands to whom the science is a pill, and the story the sugar-coating, making the pill "swallowable."

- Elsie's Girlhood.* By MARTHA FARQUHARSON. 12mo., pp. 422. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1872.
- The Lillingstones of Lillingstone.* By EMMA JANE WORBOISE. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 423. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1872.
- Daniel Boone, the Pioneer of Kentucky.* By John S. C. ABBOTT. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 331. Dodd & Mead. 1872.
- Granville Valley.* By JACOB ABBOTT. 12mo., pp. 346. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1872.
- For Conscience' Sake.* By the Author of "Alice Lee's Discipline," etc. 12mo., pp. 215. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1872.
- Fifteen Years of Prayer in the Fulton-street Meeting.* By S. IRENEUS PRIME. 12mo., pp. 345. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1872.

The following works received, and notices postponed to next Quarterly:

Blackie's Four Phases of Morals. Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.
Whittier's Poems. Complete. J. R. Osgood & Co.

Under the efficient superintendence of Dr. Vincent a great activity prevails in the Sunday-School Department of our Church. The Committee of Instruction has issued a circular announcing the commencement in January of the new course of Bible Study which is based upon the "International Series," but which supplements a CHURCH COURSE comprising "Catechism Number One," "Special Lessons in Bible History, Chronology, and Geography," "Memory Lessons" from Scripture, etc.

This is a grand movement. We wish it abundant success. The following is the FIRST YEAR'S COURSE:

1. TWENTY-FOUR LESSONS IN GENESIS, with Home Readings, occasional Lectures, special class-exercises, etc., by which the whole book of Genesis may be carefully examined.

2. TWENTY-FOUR LESSONS IN MATTHEW, with special studies as above. The design of the "International Committee" is thus set forth in their report: "Some portion of each year (of the seven) will be spent in studying the character and work of Christ—half the first year to his life as recorded by Matthew. During the second year similar studies will be suggested in *Mark*, and after that in *Luke* and *John*," etc., etc.

3. MEMORY LESSONS. "The Ten Commandments," "The Lord's Prayer," "The First, Twenty-Third, and One Hundredth Psalms," "The Beatitudes," "The Apostles' Creed," "The Baptismal Covenant."

4. SUPPLEMENTAL LESSONS in the "Bible as a Book," the "Books of the Bible," "Outlines of Bible History, Chronology, and Geography."

5. THE CHURCH CATECHISM. NUMBER ONE.

6. SPECIAL MISSIONARY EXERCISES.